Materials for the study of the Vaiśeṣika system

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor
aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. L. Leertouwer,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Godgeleerdheid,
volgens besluit van het college van dekanen
te verdedigen op woensdag 11 Oktober 1995
te klokke 14.15 uur

door

Harunaga Isaacson

geboren te Kuma, Japan, in 1965

Promotiecomissie:

Promotores:	Prof. Dr. T. E. Vetter
	Prof. Dr. A. Wezler (Universität Hamburg)
Co-promotor:	Dr. H. T. Bakker (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)
Referent:	Prof. Dr. J. Bronkhorst (Université de Lausanne)
Overige leden:	Prof. Dr. H. W. Bodewitz
	Prof. Dr. K. R. van Kooij

Deze onderzoekingen werden gesteund door de Stichting voor Filosofie en Theologie, die wordt gesubsidieerd door de Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO).

PREFACE

The disparate parts of this thesis have this in common: making use of Sanskrit manuscript material which has been largely unknown or ignored until now, they each attempt to contribute to our knowledge of the Vaiśeṣika by improving on earlier editions of commentary literature or, in Part 3, by presenting hitherto unpublished recensions of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS). No systematic study of this school of thought is offered here, however, nor even of a particular topic treated therein.[1] It was precisely in the course of attempting such historical studies that, again and again, I found textual difficulties to present so serious a hindrance that it was clear, should they be left undealt with, that the results would rest on flimsy foundations.

Of course I am well aware that there are other lines of approach which could be taken to attempt to improve our knowledge and understanding of the Vaiśeṣika, and it is by no means my intention to denigrate them. One may mention in particular the continuing search for material outside the Vaiśeṣika tradition proper that casts light on it, be it by quotations or direct or oblique references. This may be of great value both in confirming and in supplementing our primary sources. A reason for not devoting much of the present work to exploring this approach is that it is one to which quite a few scholars have paid and continue to pay due attention,[2] whereas as far as I know manuscript studies of the kind undertaken here are considerably less popular, despite their undeniable importance.

Among primary sources, the most important one left untouched is the curious work, preserved only in a Chinese translation, of which the author's name is generally supposed to have been Candramati and the title *Daśapadārthaśāstra*.[3] To have

1 That this is not through lack of interest nor a belief that such studies are useless may be seen from a small contribution dealing with the development of a single theme (Isaacson 1994).

2 Most recently, Hattori and Tachikawa have studied the material relevant for Vaiśeṣika that can be found in the works attributed to Bhavya (Bhāvaviveka) preserved in Tibetan translations: both presented papers hereon at the panel on early Vaiśeṣika at the 34th ICANAS, August 1993.

3 On this text see in the first place Ui 1962 (first published 1917) and Frauwallner 1955. There is also a re-translation into Sanskrit by K. Shukla (*Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 19 (1962–1963), 147–158 and 20 (1963–1965), 111–130), of somewhat dubious value I would

attempted to deal afresh with this work would have been foolhardy in one lacking the necessary linguistic competence; I am happy to leave that to a scholar who is equally at home in Sinology and Indology.

Within its limited scope, the contents of this volume represent a step forward, drawing as it does on important manuscript material that has not been used before. Nonetheless the basic work of collecting manuscripts and of editing the few remaining Vaiśeṣika works is still far from done. To confine ourselves to the works we know of and to some of the most urgent cases: Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* (PDhS) has been edited frequently, but never critically and never with the use of all the material that might be drawn on for that purpose;[4] Vyomaśiva's commentary on the PDhS, the *Vyomavatī*, still awaits an editor willing and able to prepare a critical edition based directly on the ancient manuscript in Mysore; Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS still requires much more attention, in both its versions, particularly the portions which have not been taken up for consideration here; the 'Senā Court' commentary on *adhyāya* 10 of the VS has yet to be published; and Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyalīlāvatī* too seems to me to be badly in need of attention from a scholar with learning and critical judgment.[5] All of these represent large and difficult tasks—it is to be regretted that the people to whom they might be entrusted with confidence are so rare. It should also be stressed that here too, as of course in other fields of ancient Indian studies, there is an urgency of which it is necessary to be conscious: as time advances much of India's precious legacy of manuscripts, the record of millennia of literary and scholarly activity of great brilliance, is being destroyed at a rapid pace. Of classical, Greek and Latin, texts it may be true that our editions are 'good enough to live with,'[6] but this is not the case with the works of

say. Prof. Dr. K. Miyamoto has recently informed me that he intends to publish a critical edition of the Chinese text and a fresh Sanskrit re-translation.

4 There may be some hope that this situation will improve in not too long a time. Several scholars have turned their attention to the problems of this text in recent years; their work is surveyed in Appendix 3 below, where I have also ventured some suggestions on how to deal with the not inconsiderable text-critical problems with which a would-be editor is faced.

5 It appears that O. Grohma had begun to study the *Nyāyalīlāvatī*, with a view to making it the subject of a 'Habilitationsschrift,' shortly before his early death; see G. Oberhammer's brief obituary in WZKS 19 (1975), 182.

6 A classical scholar of distinction, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, who in his youth also distinguished himself as a Sanskritist and Tibetanist, wrote some time ago the following words on the situation of Greek and Latin textual criticism.

> It is generally recognized that a classical editor's first duty is to furnish the best possible text. Professor Dodds of Oxford, himself a highly accomplished textual critic, once opined that our (classical) texts are good enough to live with. I suppose that de-

ancient India. A large number remain unedited to this day, and most of the editions we do have are intolerably poor—intolerably at least for those whose aim is not the construction of grandiose theories without a really reliable basis. This is not to say that the defects of our editions entail that nothing useful can be done on the basis of studying them, only that anyone who has become aware of the extent of the problem can hardly use them without having most serious doubts as to their reliability and without realizing how sharp is the need for improvement.[7]

Without wasting more words, let me simply ask anyone who still thinks that the printed editions we have can be generally relied on without requiring special caution, to compare the edition given in Part I below with Thakur's edition of the same portion of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary—bearing in mind that even further improvement is certainly possible.

A single technical note may be advisable; in quoting from printed Sanskrit texts I have on some occasions made silent alterations in non-material points, such as

> pends in the first place on one's standard of living. Certainly a great deal has been done for nearly all of them (much more for some than for others): a good modern text compared with a sixteenth-century one will show that on every page. But not all modern texts are good. Many are produced by editors badly trained and badly equipped, conservative because the evidence of their manuscripts is the only evidence they think they understand, who not only fail to push back the frontiers of darkness but revel in it as their natural environment... Let us hope that a few competent practitioners and a larger number of instructed readers will continue to keep the new barbarians at bay. (Shackleton Bailey 1976, 26–27)

It need hardly be said that compared with classical studies, the situation for texts in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan is infinitely worse, and that 'competent practitioners' are so few as to sometimes appear in danger of disappearing.

7 I may permit myself the indulgence of self-quotation on this point: 'My plea is therefore in the first place that we should not forget how our knowledge ultimately rests on highly perishable documents, the larger part of which has yet to be studied thoroughly. This is something which some who work exclusively with printed texts may occasionally lose sight of. This does not mean that I advocate all of us immediately leaving our desks to go in search of manuscripts, although I do think that such work must be kept up by a few at least. But we should remember not to accord the editions we have more authority than they deserve. Chance has played too great a rôle in determining which texts are now available to us as printed books, and in what form—the chance of one work surviving while another was lost; the chance of one being transmitted more or less faithfully while another was corrupted by poor scribes or changed deliberately to suit the needs or taste of a later period; the chance of one being discovered while another molders in an unsearched stack of manuscripts; the chance of one finding a competent and sensitive editor while another suffers from the rough hands of an impatient scholar, all too quick to emend what he does not understand. With this in our minds, we would do well to be humble about the reconstructions we may arrive at of the thought of writers separated from us by so many centuries and the work of so many scribes.' (Isaacson 1995, 777).

punctuation or orthography. All substantive changes have of course been indicated as such. When quoting from manuscripts, however, the orthography and punctuation of the scribes have been reproduced as closely as possible.

I have been helped by many people in the course of preparing this work, and have tried to acknowledge this at the most appropriate places. My greatest debt is to my teachers; unfortunately I cannot thank them all here as I would like to. I would however like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to two *sabrahmacārins*, Dominic Goodall and Claudius Nenninger. From both I have learnt much, in conversation and while reading Sanskrit texts together, and their good nature and friendship are things I value much and that cannot be valued too highly.

Finally, it should be said that despite the sincerity of my attempts and the patience of my teachers in correcting my mistakes, I am in no doubt that errors remain in my work. I can only hope that it will not be long before others take the next significant step to improve on it and succeed in making the voices of these thinkers heard yet more clearly.

CONTENTS

PART I

BHAṬṬA VĀDĪNDRA'S COMMENTARY ON THE VS

This part consists of a new edition and an annotated translation of selected chapters from a commentary on the VS which is, as will be shown below, an abridged version of a much lengthier commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. The edition seeks to improve on the text established by Anantalal Thakur in the *editio princeps* of 1957; unlike that edition it is based directly on the manuscript, a *codex unicus*. As far as I know no substantial portion of the commentary has been translated into any language before. This is in part due, no doubt, to the fact that despite Thakur's efforts the text that he gives is often incorrect and indeed incomprehensible.

1.1 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

We are fortunate in knowing with some degree of certainty when the philosopher Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra[1] lived and wrote. There is, briefly, evidence for his date chiefly from two quarters: the references he himself makes to his royal patrons, and a verse in which his direct pupil Bhaṭṭa Rāghava gives the year in which he, in his turn, wrote his *Nyāyasāravicāra*. Both of these types of evidence were already taken into account by M. R. Telang, the editor of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* (MVV), who was the first scholar to deal with our author and his date, and whose discussion is characterized by good sense. However, although Telang arrived at quite acceptable conclusions, some recent publications make statements with re-

1 Our author also uses and is referred to by other names and epithets, notably Mahādeva, Harakiṃkara and Śaṃkarakiṃkara; possibly also Vādīśa (cf. p. 8 below). Whether Mahādeva should indeed to be regarded as his 'real name,' as Telang concludes after a brief discussion (1920, xi–xii), is not quite certain. I think (should that rather be regarded as an abbreviation of Mahādevakiṃkara?); be that as it may, I have chosen to refer to him throughout in the way he himself uses most frequently, which is also the one in which many (though not all) other authors make reference to him. Self-references may be located with the help of Appendix 4; for references to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in other writers' works see Telang 1920, 35–38.

gard to these matters which, far from bringing our knowledge any further, seem to represent a step backwards, and it may not be out of place to once more set down what we know and what may safely be conjectured.

In the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*, the third verse of the third *pariccheda* runs as follows.

> *teṣām*[2] *eṣa viśeṣeṇa nirākaraṇasambhramaḥ* |
> *śrīsiṃhadharmādhyakṣeṇa*[3] ***vādīndreṇa*** *vidhīyate* || (MVV 99.20–21)

Telang (1920, xii) proposed identifying the Śrīsiṃha of this verse with the Yādava king Śiṅghana (or Siṃhaṇa), and pointed out that other authors patronized by this king (or his successor), notably Hemādri, the author / compiler of the *Caturvarga-cintāmaṇi*, and Jalhaṇa or Jahlaṇa, the compiler of the *Sūktimuktāvalī*, call him Siṃha or Śrīsiṃha. There is abundant material available on this king and his reign, both from inscriptions and from (semi-)historical works of literature. He most probably assumed the throne in A.D. 1210 and died towards the end of A.D. 1246; his successor Kṛṣṇa was crowned in November or December A.D. 1246.[4]

The other key piece of evidence to which Telang drew attention is the concluding verse of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's commentary on the *Nyāyasāra*, the *Nyāyasāravicāra*.[5] This author refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as his guru in several places, as well as quoting verses from him which have not been preserved elsewhere. Unfortunately, the chronogram verse is not completely unambiguous, and it is possible to interpret the intended year as Śaka 1174 (A.D. 1252) or as Śaka 1274 (A.D. 1352).[6] Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's own reference to his patron, however, led Telang to decide in favour of the former possibility. No other king Siṃha, or one similarly named, is known whose period of rule agrees closely enough with the alternative possibility.

Another argument against the later dating for Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's work was given by Gopinath Kaviraj, who mentions the fact that a manuscript of the *Nyāyasāra-vicāra* in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, contains a statement of purchase written by a later hand and dated *saṃvat* 1428. To quote Kaviraj:

2 The demonstrative pronoun refers to the proponents of the Mahāvidyā syllogisms, mentioned in the preceding verse as *śivādityāditārkikāḥ*.

3 Bhuvanasundarasūri's commentary paraphrases *śrīsiṃhanareśvarasya dharmādhikāriṇā* (99.21–22).

4 A convenient and reliable source of information on the reign of this king and further references is Altekar 1982, 531–543.

5 Telang and Gopinath Kaviraj (1961 [first published 1924]) both quoted this work from manuscripts. It was finally published for the first time in 1976, edited by Umā Ramaṇa Jha.

6 For discussion see Telang 1920, xii and Kaviraj 1961, 31 n. 67.

> This statement shows that the Ms. was purchased in A.D. 1371. Consequently the date of transcription must be earlier, and that of composition much earlier still. In view of this circumstance the alternative of A.D. 1352 as the date of the composition of the work does not strike me as probable. I therefore accept the former interpretation of the verse and take the date to represent A.D. 1252. (Kaviraj 1961 [first published 1924] 31 n.67).[7]

Another important piece of information is learned from the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, which was not available to Telang. According to a colophon which follows the extended commentary on the first three sūtras—here called *trisūtrīvyākhyā*—the work was written by the Yādava king (Śrī)kṛṣṇa.[8] The other colophons, it should be noted, as well as the opening verse of the work, refer to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra alone as the author, and contain no reference to this king. No matter how this discrepancy is to be explained,[9] the attribution is likely to be little more than a courtly fiction;[10] but the explicit mention of the *yadukula* confirms Telang's assumption, and it therefore is safe to conclude that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra survived his first patron and continued his philosophical writings at the court of king Kṛṣṇa, the grandson of Siṃhaṇa, who is known to have reigned from A.D. 1246–1260.

Further corroboration can be found in the fact, also adduced by Telang, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and his *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* are referred to by the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedāntin Veṅkaṭanātha, who is thought to have flourished between A.D. 1267 and A.D. 1369. Though this is not sufficient to settle anything, it is more consistent with a date in the thirteenth than in the fourteenth century, especially since Veṅkaṭanātha does not refer to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as a contemporary, but together with Udayana

7 Despite these earlier discussions, the editor of the *Nyāyasāravicāra*, Jha, to one's surprise simply states that the work was composed in A.D. 1352, quoting the disputed verse as proof with no mention of the fact that it is open to a different interpretation, and one which seems to accord better with other known facts (introduction, p. 18).

8 *iti śrīyadukulakamalakalikāvikāsabhāskarabhūpālalalitamahārājādhirājaśrīkṛṣṇabhūpālaviracite tarkasāgaranāmni vaiśeṣikasūtravārttike trisūtrīvyākhyā samāptā* (Thakur 1960, 23 n.2; *Tarkasāgara* 57.18–22); cf. also p. 12 below.

9 One possibility would be that it is only the *trisūtrīvyākhyā* which is intended to be attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's patron, despite the fact that the compound °*viracite* qualifies *vaiśeṣikasūtravārttike* and not *trisūtrivyākhyā*. This interpretation was presupposed in Isaacson 1995, 766–767 footnote 44, with no mention of the fact that it is not supported by the actual wording of the colophon and is far from certain.

10 In this I agree with Thakur, who writes: 'The attribution only shows Vādīndra's devotion to Śrīkṛṣṇabhūpāla who seems to be his patron in later life. The work was written by Vādīndra himself and the initial verse is clear on this point' (1960, 23). It may be added that both the content and the style of the *trisūtrīvyākhyā* stamp this section too as the work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

(Telang 1920, xiv).

To summarize the facts of which we may be certain, we know that the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*, which was probably Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's earliest work (cf. p. 6 below), was written during the reign of Siṃhaṇa, i.e. sometime between A.D. 1210 and A.D. 1246, and that the commentary on the VS, which there is reason to think may be his last work (cf. p. 13 below), was written when Kṛṣṇa was king, i.e. sometime between A.D. 1246 and A.D. 1260. Furthermore, we know that a direct disciple of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra composed a work in A.D. 1252. As far as I can see, it is not possible to pinpoint matters any closer than this. One might speculate that, since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was alive in A.D. 1246, he probably also was still alive in A.D. 1252, because there is nothing in Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's references to his guru to suggest that he had died not long before. But this is obviously a flimsy argument, based on presuppositions which can not be verified. In any case, if pressed for dates, it would be reasonable to say that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was probably active between about A.D. 1230 and A.D. 1250, the former of these dates being the less firm of the two. As to the place where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra worked, his apparently close connection with two successive ruling monarchs makes their capital city Devagiri (modern Daulatabad) in northern Mahārāṣṭra the most likely candidate.

Beyond this, there is little information that can be gleaned about Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's life. The concluding verse of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* gives the name of a guru from whom Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra acquired *śabdavidyā* as Yogīśvara; there are no other references to this or other teachers in his work.[11] This Yogīśvara is not known, as far as I am aware, from any other source. The description of our author by his commentator Bhuvanasundarasūri (writing perhaps two hundred years or so after Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) as *tarkasāhityālaṅkārādisakalaśāstrasārthāmbhodhipārīṇapratibhaḥ svakīyādūṣyavaiduṣyakalārañjitanānānarendrasabhaḥ* (MVV 1.21–22) is not one on which too much reliance can be placed, I would have thought, though Thakur seems to accept this without questioning as 'showing that he was proficient in various śāstras including Logic, Literature and Poetics and he 'decorated' many royal courts by his presence' (Thakur 1960, 22). Bhuvanasundarasūri may well be simply elaborating with some imagination on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's reference to his position as *dharmādhyakṣa* at Siṃhaṇa's court. We have no internal evidence that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was as versed in *sāhitya* and *alaṅkāraśāstra* as he was in *tarka*; there is certainly little in his prose style that suggests it.[12]

In view of the consistent body of evidence as to the period in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra lived, it is rather surprising to see that some modern scholars have

11 The verse runs ***yogīśvaraguroḥ*** *śabdavidyām āsādya tattvataḥ* | *vyadhatta bhaṭṭavādīndro mahāvidyāviḍambanam* || (MVV 149.21–22).

12 For a few comments on the style of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings see p. 39f. below.

given significantly different dates for him, usually without adducing any arguments. Thus B. K. Matilal, in a booklet intended as a guide to the literature of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, in one place dates our author 'ca. fourteenth century A.D.' (1977, 59) and in another says that he 'might have been a senior contemporary of Maṇikaṇṭha,' whom he puts at A.D. 1300 (1977, 103), in neither case giving reason or reference. In yet another place he speaks of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS as 'belonging to the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D.' (1977, 75), and mentions that 'Thakur conjectures that it may be from the pen of Vādīndra,' without, however, commenting on the discrepancy between such a conjecture, his own dating of the text and his dating of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

Another recent reference work on Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, the second volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, is less inconsistent and a little nearer the mark, but the dates given there, apparently on the authority of D. C. Bhattacharya,[13] of (A.D.) 1175–1225 (Potter 1977, 11) must be too early by at least a quarter of a century. As for the observation that, on the grounds of his being Siṃhaṇa's '*dharmādhyakṣin*' (sic, for *dharmādhyakṣa*) and being patronized by Kṛṣṇa, he flourished 'during the first quarter of the 13th century' (Potter 1977, 646), this seems to go flagrantly against the plentiful epigraphic and other evidence for the dates of reign of both these kings.[14]

1.2 Other works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

Before turning to the commentary on the VS which is our main concern here, something should be said about the other works by our author of which we have knowledge.

13 No precise reference is given, and the only work of D. C. Bhattacharya available to me in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's date is mentioned speaks of him as having flourished 'in the reign of the famous Yādava king Siṃhana (1210–47 A.D.)' (1958, 64), which does not accord well with the dates given on his authority by Potter.

14 A minor quibble on the relative dating proposed in Potter 1977: Vādivāgīśvara is placed after Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (p. 11), but, as was pointed out already by Thakur (1960, 29) the latter refers to Vādivāgīśvara (see *Tarkasāgara* 184.25 and 221.26), who therefore probably predates him or is a senior contemporary.

1.2.1 *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*

This work explaining and refuting the Mahāvidyā syllogism[15] was the first of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings to be published. It seems also to have been the most famous and was very probably the first to be written; at least, as we shall see below, there are some indications which suggest that the other surviving works were composed later. In any case, it is the only one which has been preserved complete and on which commentaries are extant. Telang was able to make use of three manuscripts of the text itself, three of a commentary on it by Bhuvanasundarasūri,[16] and one incomplete manuscript of another commentary by one Ānandapūrṇa.[17]

1.2.2 Commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*

Two years after Telang's edition of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* was published, another work by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra appeared under the title *Rasasāra*. This is a commentary, of which but a single manuscript is known to survive, on the *guṇa* section of Udayana's *Kiraṇāvalī* (itself of course a commentary on Praśastapāda's PDhS). The editor, Gopinath Kaviraj, remarked that the title is a somewhat strange one, and pointed out that this name (as well as the name of the commentator) is not referred to in the body of the text, but is given 'on the covering leaf only' (introduction, p. 2).[18] It is my opinion that this name is indeed wrong; possibly the covering leaf in fact originally belonged to another manuscript. That *Rasasāra* was not the name given by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra to his commentary on Udayana's work is demonstrated by a reference to it by the author himself; in the long version of the VS commentary we read at one place '[*prapañcitaṃ*][19] ***caitad asmābhir haraprasādanāmni kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇake*** (135.14; cf. Thakur 1960, 24).

15 On this topic see especially the introduction by Telang to his edition of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* and the summary of the text by E. R. Sreekrishna Sharma in Potter 1977, 647–652.

16 Telang gives A.D. 1399–1460 as approximate dates for this Śvetāmbara Jaina author (p. xxix).

17 Telang identifies this Ānandapūrṇa with the author of a commentary on Śrīharṣa's *Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya* and places him between A.D. 1529 and A.D. 1600 (p. xxv–xxvii).

18 It should be noted that, as Kaviraj points out, although when seen by him the manuscript contained no indication of the author of the work, Hall, in his *Contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems* had referred to the same manuscript and identified the author as 'Mahádeva Vádíndra, pupil of one Śaṅkara' (Hall 1859, 67). Kavirāja concluded, not unreasonably, that 'the Ms. in Hall's time contained one leaf or rather half-leaf more at the end—the last, I believe, bearing either in the colophon or elsewhere the name and other particulars of the author' (introduction p. 2).

19 The brackets presumably indicate here that the word has been supplied by the editor to fill a lacuna.

Several decades intervened before, in 1956, another text by our author was published. This time it was his commentary on the *dravya* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, edited, again from a unique manuscript (in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta), by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha and published with no other title than *Kiraṇāvalīṭīkā*.[20] It is likely that the two parts of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary in fact belong together as a single work. This is suggested by the fact that at the one place where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself refers to the work (see above), no specification is added as to which part of the *Kiraṇāvalī* it commented on. Furthermore, the commentary on the *guṇa* section opens with a single verse of obeisance to Śiva, which is identical to the *maṅgala* verse of the third *pariccheda* of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*. This suggests that this was merely the beginning of a new section, not of an entirely different work, especially because in the two cases where the beginning of a work by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is preserved, the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* and the (long) commentary on the VS, we find more than one introductory verse and a mention of the author's name. Though the author himself refers to the work as the *Haraprasādanāma Kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇaka*, as we just saw, in view of the fact that it has been published in two different parts and by different editors, I refer to these parts in the following for convenience sake as *Dravyakiraṇāvalīṭīkā* (DKṬ) and *Guṇakiraṇāvalīṭīkā* (GKṬ) respectively.

As to the relative dating of this work, it is clear that it must be earlier than the VS commentary, since the latter refers to it. In relation to the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* it is likely to be later, for though that work is not directly mentioned, a verse at the end of the section on *īśvarasiddhi* refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's mastery of the *mahāvidyā* syllogism.[21] Admittedly this can hardly be called strong evidence, but it seems a plausible assumption that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first distinguished himself with the highly specialized brief treatise and later demonstrated his command of a broader field by the writing of the *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary.

An additional piece of circumstancial evidence might be found in the fact that it is only in the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions and acknowledges his debt to a teacher;[22] this could be thought to be consistent with the assump-

20 There may be said to be a slight bibliographical confusion about this publication, in that Potter's *Bibliography* (for all its shortcomings a very helpful as well as a unique work) gives the title of the commentary as *Rasasāra* (1983, 213, item 3997), in other words, identical with that under which the commentary on the *guṇa* section appeared. This error is presumably responsible for another, more serious one: in the account of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and his works given in the volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies* dealing with pre-Gaṅgeśa Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika (Potter 1977), only the commentary on the *guṇa* section is mentioned and (rather inadequately) summarized.

21 *pravartante jagannātha sanāthā nirupadravāḥ mahāvidyādivinyāsā mayi śaṅkarakiṃkare* | DKṬ 677.22-23.

22 Cf. p. 4 above.

tion that it is his earliest work. This argument, which is in any event one of dubious value, is nullified, however, by the fact that the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* is the only one of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works to have been preserved in its entirety, as it cannot be ruled out that if we had the two commentaries in the form in which they were written we would find similar references to his teacher(s).

As the oldest commentary known to have been preserved on the *Kiraṇāvalī*, this work is obviously of considerable interest and importance. Particularly noteworthy is that on several occasions Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra refers to and discusses variant readings of Udayana's work;[23] at other places, though he does not mention variants, it can be determined that the reading commented on differs from that in the printed editions we have.[24] It is therefore somewhat disappointing that in the only translation and study of a substantial section from the *Kiraṇāvalī* published so far (Tachikawa 1981), Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is neither drawn on nor even mentioned.

1.2.3 Other works attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

On one ground or another the following works have been attributed to our author.

A commentary on the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* As was first pointed out by Kaviraj in the introduction to his edition of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* (p. 6; repeated at Kaviraj 1961, 30), Śeṣa Śārṅgadhara (fl. ca. A.D. 1450), in his commentary *Nyāyamuktāvalī* on Udayana's *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, refers to an alternative explanation, which he attributes to a Vādīśa.[25] The same author also mentions 'Vādīndra',[26] and Kaviraj believes that our author is meant in both cases, and on this ground attributes a commentary on the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* to him. Potter mentions this attribution and, with a question-mark, lists such a work under the writings of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (Potter 1977,

23 Three instances of this are cited by Thakur (1960, 25 n.3); the third, for which he fails to give a reference, is to be found at GKṬ 35.2-8. Yet another reference to *prathamapustakalekhakadoṣa* may be found at DKṬ 630.7. Another case that may be mentioned is at DKṬ 619.4, where after commenting on the compound *pravitatabahuvelaprakriyājāladuḥstham* in the fourth introductory verse of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra remarks *kvacit tu pravitatabahuvelam iti pāṭhaḥ*. Incidentally, Jetly's edition of the *Kiraṇāvalī* reads the line in question *pravitatabahuvelaṃ prakriyājāla**duḥkham***; his apparatus reports a variant °*vela*° for °*velaṃ* in an earlier edition.

24 The editors of DKṬ and GKṬ have drawn attention in footnotes to some, though not all, of these instances.

25 The reference is found at 29.19–23; the passage reads *vādīśas tu sādhanaśabdasya kāraṇavācitvam abhyupagamya nirvikalpakajanakaśarīrasaṃyogādhikaraṇatve sati yogajadharmājanyajanyasākṣātkārāviṣayatve sati śarītvānadhikaraṇam indriyam iti yathāśrutam evaitad vyācakṣate*. From the style this could certainly be a definition proposed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra; unfortunately we have no definition of *indriya* in the three surviving works to compare it with.

26 At 23.6 and 42.6; cf. Telang 1920, 38.

11: cf. also 647). I see no way of establishing any more certainty in this matter. Certainly Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was well acquainted with Udayana's works, as is shown by his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* and his references to the (*Nyāya*)*kusumāñjali* (DKṬ 663.14, GKṬ 92.24), however it would be a little surprising if he indeed selected this relatively minor work of Udayana's to comment on.

***Kāṇādarahasya*?** Matilal writes in his fascicule on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika in the *History of Indian Literature* that 'Vādīndra (ca. fourteenth century A.D.) says in his Kāṇāda-rahasya that an old Vaiśeṣika-sūtra text was originally composed by Lord Śiva and the present sūtra text was written by Kaṇāda when Lord Śiva, taking the form of an owl, instructed Kaṇāda' (1977, 59). No reference or authority is given for this statement, which I am inclined to regard as a slip of the pen. No other source known to me attributes a *Kāṇādarahasya* to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, and the other references to a work of this title in Matilal's book are all to a composition of Śaṃkara Miśra. Matilal must have meant to write *Kāṇādasūtranibandha*, and the statement is no doubt based on the brief description of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS given by Thakur, where he writes that 'Vādīndra informs us that one *Prācīna-vaiśeṣikamahāsūtra* composed by Lord 'Siva' [sic] himself is presupposed by the present *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* which also was taught to Kaṇāda by the Lord in the form of an owl' (1960, 28).[27]

27 The passages from the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on which this remark was based are now at last available in the Sanskrit, and run as follows. *na ca parameśvarapra-sādāsāditadharmādisākṣātkāravān parameśvaraniyuktaś ca bhagavān kaṇādo munir ity atra mānābhāvaḥ, sāmpradāyikācārapramāṇatvāt | upadiśanti hi [sāmpradāyikāḥ] kaṇādo munir ulūkaveṣadhāriṇaḥ parameśvarād dharmādisākṣātkāradharmopadeśaniyogam āsādya vaiśeṣi-kasūtram asūtrayad iti* (2.7–10). *kimartham tarhi dharmavyākhyānam | parārtham ity avai-iti | parair avagato dharmo 'nuṣṭhīyate ca pareṣāṃ svargāpavargasiddheḥ | paragatau svargā-pavargau na phalam iti cet—na, pareṣām eva phalavāt | paragato 'parasya na phalam iti cet—na, nityamuktasya bhagavataḥ parameśvarasya dharmādharmasādhanopadeśavedapra-ṇetuḥ paragatasvargāpavargaprayojanatvena dṛṣṭāntavirahāt | vaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetuḥ para-gatau svargāpavargau na prayojanam iti cet—na, īśvarasyāpi prācīnavaiśeṣikamahāsūtrapra-ṇetṛtvābhyupagamāt | etadvaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetuḥ paragatau svargāpavargau na prayojanam iti cet—na, īśvarasyāpy etatsūtrapraṇetṛtvābhyupagamāt |* (8.21–24). With regard to the second passage, however, it should be noted that it has been partially misrepresented by Thakur, for the twice repeated *īśvarasyāpi* apparently intends to emphasize that Śiva *also*, i.e., presumably, together with Kaṇāda, is a *praṇetṛ* of the VS: this is confirmed by the fact that the text continues *anīśvaropadeśānāṃ dvikartṛkatvād, dṛṣṭāntābhāvāc ca* (8.24; presumably *anīśvaropadeśānāṃ* must be taken as meaning authoritative teachings which were not given by God himself directly and alone, as the Vedas were). As for the reference to a *prācīnavaiśeṣikamahāsūtra*, it is most likely another example of the old and well attested Indian idea that the knowledge and revealed texts now available to us are but a fraction of an original more extensive revelation.

A metrical philosophical treatise Kaviraj, in his introduction to the edition of the commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, suggested that 'the quotations under Vādīndra's name as given in the Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha and Nyāyasāravichāra being in verse, it seems likely that he was the author of a metrical tract' (introduction, p. 6; repeated at Kaviraj 1961, 30). Little can be said on this matter; it is possible that our author indeed wrote such a work, but it is also possible that the verses in question were embedded in a prose work—there are occasional verses in the surviving portions long version of the VS commentary.

1.3 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS

1.3.1 The editions of the two versions

In the introduction to his excellent edition of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* Telang already mentioned Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, referring to the recent acquisition of (manuscripts of) a *Kaṇādasūtranibandha* by the Madras Government Oriental Library (1920, xvi). Telang himself had no access to these manuscripts, and it was some decades before more became known about this commentary. In 1957 a slim volume appeared containing the text of the VS together with what the title-page called an anonymous commentary.[28] It was edited, by Anantalal Thakur, on the basis of a Devanāgarī transcript of a palm-leaf manuscript in Malayalam script (see the discussion on p. 41ff. below). In the introduction, Thakur writes that the commentary 'agrees with the sūtra tradition followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra of the South. A preliminary study of the available portions of the Kaṇādasūtranibandha of Vādīndra has convinced us that the present commentary is an abridged version of this ᶜnibandha.'[29] Some time later, after a more thorough comparison of the text he had edited with transcripts of the Madras manuscripts of the commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra on the VS, Thakur concluded that the former was indeed 'nothing but an abridged version of the *Nibandha* giving mainly the interpretation of the sūtras. It

Finally, aside from these passages found only in the long version of the VS commentary one may also note Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's explanation of *uktam* in 2.1.13 (numbered 2.1.12 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version): *uktam iti bhagavatolūkaveṣadhāriṇā mahādevenety arthaḥ* (TS 218.11 ≈ V 20.23).

28 Some of the material in the following part of the introduction is taken over, with additions and changes, from Isaacson 1995, section V.

29 English introduction p. 8. The corresponding passage in the Sanskrit *bhūmikā* reads *trayodaśaśatakasthitasya śaṅkarakiṅkarāparanāmno bhaṭṭavādīndrasya kaṇādasūtranibandhena prastutasya granthasya dṛḍhaḥ sambandho vihaṅgamadṛśā avalokito 'smābhiḥ | iyaṃ hi vyākhyā viṣayasāmyena bhāṣāsāmyena ca tasya nibandhasyaiva sārasaṃgraharūpā ity ābhāti* (p. 26).

must have been prepared by Vādīndra himself or some of his followers for those who were interested in the purport of the sūtras and had no aptitude to enter into the abundant discussions of the *Nibandha*.'[30]

The publication of the extant portion of the full commentary, edited again by Thakur, unfortunately only followed very much later, in 1985. This edition is in many respects less satisfactory than the edition of the abridgement: we are, for instance, given no information on the manuscript basis of the text.[31] Since variant readings are never given, one suspects that the text may be no more than a transcript, sporadically corrected, of a single manuscript.[32] This publication also contained a reprint of the text of the abridged commentary in an appendix. This has however practically no value; it introduces new misprints, contains no improvements (though a number would have been possible on the basis of the longer version: cf. below), and does not even incorporate the corrections contained in the list of addenda and corrigenda appended to the original edition. Finally, a second appendix contained another welcome *editio princeps*, this time of the ninth *adhyāya*

30 Thakur 1960, 27. Thakur reaffirmed his opinion that the brief 'anonymous' commentary was an abridgement of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's voluminous one in the introduction he contributed to Muni Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary (p. 17).

31 There is no introduction by the editor, though we find an *āmukham* by Dr. Jayamanta Miśra and an *aumakramikam* [sic] by Ānanda Jhā. Neither of these provides the sort of information that a student of the text looks for first.

32 In his article on this text Thakur had mentioned that three manuscripts in Malayalam script are preserved in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (1960, 25). When I visited this library in 1991, I was able to see the three original palm-leaf manuscripts, and to determine that they are in an extremely precarious state. There are virtually no folios that are completely intact: indeed for the greater part they are no more than bundles of fragments of various size. In view of their condition I was not able to photograph them all completely, and the photographs that I did take are not all completely legible. The scholar who wishes to take up the task of preparing an improved and more critical edition of the surviving portions of this text will probably have to work in Madras directly with the manuscript fragments. In the following it is only on some rare occasions, when I have been able to locate a passage from the edition in my incomplete photographic record, that I refer to the manuscripts themselves in quoting from the long version of the commentary.
The quotations in Thakur's 1960 article are all based on transcripts of these manuscripts in the Mithilā Institute. I doubt that Thakur ever consulted the Malayalam manuscripts themselves. From his description of the extent of the manuscripts, it appears that for a large portion of the preserved text at least two manuscripts should be available. The complete lack of variant readings in the edition is therefore odd. Perhaps the edition is no more than a transcript of the largest of the Mithilā Institute transcripts, and has not been collated against the other two transcripts. Alternatively Thakur's account of the transcripts may be wrong: in my very incomplete photographic record of the palm-leaf manuscripts there seems to be no overlapping, so that it is possible that the three manuscript bundles were originally part of a single codex (though there appear to be different scribal hands at work).

of the anonymous commentary on the VS written at the Sena court—yet another text on which Thakur had given valuable information in an earlier article.[33]

1.3.2 The title of the VS commentary

It is something of a problem to determine what we should call Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's (long) commentary. The name *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* is found in three of the four colophons quoted from the manuscripts by Thakur (1960, 23 and 26);[34] the fourth uses the name *Kaṇādasūtravārttika*.[35] These colophons are again reproduced in the printed text. The colophon of the section commenting on the first three sūtras, quoted in full in footnote 8 on p. 3 above, qualifies *vaiśeṣikasūtravārttike* with *tarkasāgaranāmni*. This provides us with another candidate title, and one which is explicitly said to be a real name rather than a description or generic name (as *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* can be taken to be). Of course the extent to which colophons should be relied on in these matters is debated. Nonetheless, this particular colophon is probably authorial rather than scribal, bearing in mind the fact that it is not a concluding colophon of the work or an *adhyāya* or *āhnika*, but is a complimentary one, perhaps separating what is supposed to be the work of the royal patron (cf. footnote 9 on p. 3 above) from that of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself. Certainly the style of this colophon is more flowery than one would expect a scribal one to be, and it seems more likely that such a colophon should have been composed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra than by a later scribe unconnected with the court of Śrīkṛṣṇa. For these reasons, it is plausible that the title *Tarkasāgara* may be the one bestowed on the work by its author, and that he also calls the work a *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika*. It is therefore as the *Tarkasāgara* that I shall refer to the full commentary.[36]

The titlepage of the *Tarkasāgara* edition refers to the text as *Vaiśeṣikavārttika*, and this form of the title is also used by Halbfass (e.g. Halbfass 1992, 79). As far as I can see, there is no basis for this title in the colophons or the work itself. Most likely it is an abbreviation of *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* introduced by Thakur or—perhaps even more probably—by the publishers. In his introductions to the

33 Thakur 1965. This article contains some of the basic information on the manuscript material which one would have looked for in an introduction to the edition. The commentary on the tenth *adhyāya*, surviving, like that on the ninth, in a single manuscript in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, remains unpublished.

34 In Thakur's edition of the long version, these colophons are to be found on pp. 57, 119 and 19[illegible]

35 On p. 158 of Thakur's edition.

36 As Thakur remarks (1960, 26), this title seems a fitting one for the work; the surviving portion alone is large enough and full of *tarka* to justify it. As to whether the reader is more likely to find jewels or sea-monsters in it, this depends perhaps largely on how well equipped he is to deal with it.

edition of the abridged version. Thakur had called the text *Kaṇādasūtranibandha*, as we saw above; he also used this form in the introduction he contributed to Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS together with Candrānanda's commentary. Thakur's 1960 article refers to the work as *Kāṇādasūtranibandha*, on the basis of the second half of the opening verse of the commentary: *kāṇādasūtrasya mayā nibandho vidhīyate śaṅkarakiṅkareṇa*. Finally, the reprint of the abridgement as an appendix to Thakur's edition of the long commentary is given the name *Nibandhasāra*, an allusion to the last two possible titles. But here, again, there is no manuscript authority for such an appellation, and this is probably to be regarded as a title made up by the editor or the publisher.

As we saw above (p. 6) this text refers to the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*. It also explicitly mentions the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana*[37] and is thus beyond doubt Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's latest preserved work.

1.3.3 The relation between the two versions

Whatever its shortcomings, Thakur's publication of the surviving portions of the long version allowed scholars with no direct access to the manuscript material to compare the two commentaries for themselves, at least for a sizeable portion of the text. And in my opinion, Thakur's judgement of the relationship between the two texts is most probably correct. The difference in length between the two commentaries is very great indeed. The available portion of the longer work covers 256 pages in Thakur's edition; the corresponding text of the abridgement, as reprinted in the appendix of the same edition, merely 26. But almost each sentence of the short version can be found also in the long one, though sometimes with slightly different wording. And in numerous places the published text of the long version allows us to correct what are clearly errors in the edition of the abridgement.

This is, I believe, the general picture, but it must be admitted that there are some places where the relationship is less clear, and it is doubtless desirable that the two versions should be compared in a more detailed fashion than was done before. For a single passage, Thakur has given us the two versions printed side by side to facilitate comparison, in a footnote which, though lengthy, leaves the texts to speak for themselves without commentary. Though I cannot here deal with the question as thoroughly as it deserves, I shall adduce a few other passages to illustrate both the close relationship between the texts and the type of differences which do occur.

Sentences which are identical in both versions are easy enough to find; for our pur-

37 *prapañcitaṃ caitan* ***mahāvidyāviḍambane*** (*Tarkasāgara* 101.16).

poses it is more interesting and significant to look at differences and apparent differences. This may not only reveal the extent to which the two versions are related but also may be expected to cast light on the nature of that relation. To start with apparent differences: there are numerous places where a divergence in the texts of the two versions as printed can be shown to be a result of scribal or editorial error. Some examples:

1. ***dvau pṛthag*** *ityādivyavahārasya* ***dvitvā****vacchinnapṛthaktvād evopapatter iti kecit* TS 67.5–6

   dvipṛthag *ityādivyavahārasya dvi***tvādya***vacchinnapṛthaktvād evopapatter iti kecit* V 3.22–23

   Since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is here speaking of *vyavahāra*, the reading *dvau pṛthag* of the long version is to be preferred. And in fact this is exactly what the palm-leaf manuscript of the abridged commentary reads, so that the reading *dvipṛthag* in this case probably originated as an error in Thakur's transcript. In the case of the other divergence, I suspect that the long version ought to read *dvitvādyavachinna°*, in agreement with V, without however being able to support this by manuscript evidence.

2. A case where both versions appear to be corrupt, and the correct reading has to be reconstructed from the two together is found at the beginning of the commentary on 1.1.22 (1.1.23 in Thakur's edition of V), a sūtra reading *dravyāṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam*.

   na sāmānyam ekam avaśiṣṭam *iti yāvat |* ***tathānyaṃ*** *yad dravyaṃ yair dravyair janyate tat teṣām ekaṃ kāryam, yathā dvyaṇukaṃ paramāṇudvayadikkāleśvarāṇām* TS 124.23–25

   sāmānyaviśiṣṭam ekam *iti yāvat* | ***tathā hi*** *yad dravyaṃ yair dravyair janyate tat teṣām ekaṃ kāryam, yathā dvyaṇukaṃ paramāṇudvayadikkāleśvarāṇām* V 10.10–11

   Neither reading of the first words here yields adequate sense, in my opinion; what seems most plausible and consistent with the continuation is *sāmānyam ekam aviśiṣṭam*. The error in V may have had its origin in a transposition of the last two words. In the next sentence the *anyaṃ* of the long version is out of construction; the best seems to read *tathā hi* with V.

3. *dvitīyādikam utkṣepaṇaṃ tu prathamotkṣepaṇa****janyatvenāpi*** *janyate* TS 157.30–31

   *dvitīyādikam utkṣepaṇaṃ tu prathamotkṣepaṇa****janyavegenāpi*** *janyate* V 13.11

   The reading printed in the long version must obviously be emended to agree with that found in the short version, as is confirmed by the fact that the long version continues with the remark (omitted in the abridgement) *iti gurutvaprayatnasaṃyogavegānāṃ sāmānyaṃ kāryam iti* (TS 157.31).

4. Commenting on 1.2.3. *sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam*, we find:

sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa ity evam api saṃbuddhyapekṣam ity arthaḥ TS 162.8–9	*sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa ityevaṃvidhabu-ddhyapekṣam ity arthaḥ* V 14.5–6

Again the edition of the long version clearly has it wrong. To a large extent, the errors can be explained as resulting from confusion of similar *akṣaras* in Malayalam script.

These examples are clear enough, I believe, and they could easily be multiplied. The cases where it is the long version that appears to have a corrupt text are particularly noteworthy: if they are not due simply to error on the part of Thakur or the transcriber(s) of the Madras manuscripts they show that the transmission of the abridged version is not necessarily inferior, and that the archetype of the abridged version was free from errors that the surviving manuscripts of the long version have.

I shall now turn to a category of greater interest: discrepancies which are not obviously due to scribal or editorial error. Of what nature are these and what, if anything, can they reveal about the abridger and the way he went about his task?[38] It is necessary to attempt to assess all this too, as objectively as possible; again I shall try to make some first steps in this direction, but can do no more than that.

Roughly, the differences which may be due to more than mere involuntary, mechanical variation arising in the process of transmission can be classified under the following headings.

- Variation by substitution of synonyms or phrases which do not materially affect the sense or change the syntactic structure. There are quite a few cases of this; some may perhaps be scribal variation in the transmission of one or the other of the texts,[39] but it seems plausible that a number go back to the person who prepared the abridgement. Some examples:

38 Here and in the following I attempt to distinguish between alterations which are due to 'abridgement' and those which are 'scribal' or 'arose in the course of transmission.' It should be realized, however, that the activity I attribute to the abridger in many respects resembles scribal activity. It differs, in my conception of the two, primarily in intention. The abridger had as his priority the creation of a new, much shorter state of the text, probably with a conscious idea of guidelines along which this was to be accomplished and with a definite goal in mind. The scribes may have had various different intentions, but if these included a conscious wish to produce a new state of the text which differed from that of the examplar(s)—in distinction to a wish to recreate a more original state of the text, i.e. to correct and '(critically) edit' it—this was probably kept within rather narrow bounds by various unwritten codes. In other words, I believe that it is useful to distinguish between 'transmitters' and 'redactors' (into which group our presumed abridger would fall) of this type of text, and that there are limits to the amount of variation that the former group would deliberately introduce.

39 It is certainly necessary to be aware that substitution of synonyms seems to be an element of the *usus scribendi* of the large majority of Indian scribes.

1. With change in the word-order as well:

	*kriyāvad **guṇavat samavāyikāraṇam iti bhāvapradhāno nirdeśaḥ*** TS 92.4–5	*kriyāvad **ityādinirdeśo bhāvapradhānaḥ*** V 6.12
2.	*brāhmaṇalakṣaṇāvagamasahitena cakṣurādinā **tadanubhava** iti cet* TS 184.10–11	*brāhmaṇalakṣaṇāvagamasahitena cakṣurādinā **tadavagama** iti cet* V 15.25
3.	*na ca rūpatve **pramāṇā**bhāvaḥ* TS 200.8	*na ca rūpatve **mānā**bhāvaḥ* V 18.12
4.	*agnisaṃyogād ity **anuvartamāne** punar **agnisaṃyogād iti** niyamārtham* TS 210.1	*agnisaṃyogād iti **vartamāne** punas **tadgrahaṇaṃ** niyamārtham* V 19.20
5.	*bhāṣyakārās tu samāne vāyau bhinnadikkriyayor vāyvoḥ sammūrcchanam **icchanti*** TS 218.16	*bhāṣyakārās tu samāne vāyau bhinnadikkriyayor vāyvoḥ sammūrcchanam **ity āmananti*** V 21.3

As may be seen, the wording of the short version is usually briefer, though this is not invariably the case;[40] as a result of this it is often somewhat less explicit. On the whole I think this may be taken as supporting, though not very strongly perhaps, the supposition that the divergence is the result of the work of the abridger rather than mere scribal accident. If the latter were the case, one would expect similar scribal variation to have occurred in the transmission of both versions to roughly the same extent, and there is no good reason why scribes of the short version would consistently choose for briefer synonyms; one would imagine that instead it would be the weary copyists of the mammoth text who would tend to substitute shorter equivalents more frequently. Nor does it seem to me a very plausible theory that the longer formulations are secondary because they are sometimes more explicit, for explicitness is by no means increased in all cases of difference, and where it is, the increase is often very slight indeed.

- Omission of words which add little or nothing to the sense. This is precisely the sort of thing one would expect of someone trying to reduce Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's huge work to a more convenient size. Examples:

1.	*tac ca na śāstrāntare 'sti* TS 8.11	*tac ca na śāstrāntare* V 2.6
2.	*na caivaṃ śaṅkhādiśabda iti* TS 224.3–4	*naivaṃ śaṅkhādiśabdaḥ* V 23.8–9

40 I have of course tried to make the sample a representative one.

3. *tathā ca sparśavantaḥ paramāṇavo na śabdavantaḥ sparśavattvāt*,[41] *ghaṭavad* ***iti*** TS 224.30–31	*sparśavanto na śabdavantaḥ sparśavattvāt, ghaṭavat* V 23.14

Examples that illustrate simultaneously both omission and substitution of synonyms are also not difficult to find:

1. *tena dravyam iti yataḥ* ***pṛthivyādiṣu navasu*** *tad dravyatvam, guṇa iti yato* ***rūpādiṣu caturviṃśatiṣu*** *tad guṇatvam, karmeti yata* ***utkṣepaṇādiṣu*** *tat karmatvam*। *evaṃ sarvāsu jātiṣu* ***draṣṭavyam*** TS 176.7–9	*tena dravyam iti yataḥ* ***pṛthivyādau*** *tad dravyatvam, guṇa iti yato* ***rūpādau*** *tad guṇatvam, karmeti yata* ***utkṣepaṇādau*** *tat karmatvam* | *evaṃ sarvāsu jātiṣu* V 15.14–16
2. *pratyakṣatvaṃ* ***cātra*** *śrotrapratyakṣatvam*[42] ***vivakṣitam*** TS 225.8	*pratyakṣatvaṃ* ***śrotragrāhyatvam*** V 23.19.

- Omission of entire discussions/digressions. This is clearly the chief method by which the size of the commentary has been reduced. Many passages, often long and sometimes very interesting ones, have been excised in the abridged version. One of the largest omissions covers about 48 and a half pages of the edition of the full version, containing almost all of the commentary on 1.1.3, with numerous digressions, including a long and important section on God and his qualities[43] and a number of alternative interpretations of 1.1.1–3. The abridged version has in the same place a mere two lines. There are many other cases where what is omitted is an alternative interpretation or theory (or sometimes more than one) offered by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

All this confirms the impression that the shorter version is an abridgement which attempts to remain faithful to the original, long work, though omitting many discussions found in the latter, especially those which are of less immediate relevance for the understanding of the sūtra text. However there are also a good number of places where it seems that the redactor responsible for the abridgement allowed himself liberties greater than in any of the cases we have looked at so far and actually rephrased or rewrote sentences, changing the syntactic structure and sometimes even the content. It is clearly necessary to be aware of this and to look with some

41 *sparśavattvāt* : em., *sparśatvāt* Thakur
42 *śrotrapratyakṣatvam* : em., *śrautrapratyakṣatvam* Thakur
43 I have drawn heavily on this section in the brief discussion of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's theology on p. 32ff. below.

care at the relevant passages. Yet again the treatment I can give them is only a preliminary one, curtailed by considerations of the space and time that a thorough study would demand. The sample given below has been made a fairly large one, because of the importance of this category for the evaluation of V, but is not by any means a complete collection.

1. *kriyāvattvaṃ na dravyalakṣaṇam, ākāśādivyāvṛttatvenāvyāpakatvād iti cet—na, kriyāvattvasya kriyāvaddravyalakṣaṇatvāt | na caivam dravyalakṣaṇatvānupapattiḥ, kriyāvaddravyāṇām api dravyatvena tallakṣaṇasya dravyalakṣaṇatvāt | na caivaṃ pṛthivyādilakṣaṇānāṃ dravyalakṣaṇatvāpattiḥ, iṣṭatvāt* TS 92.5–9

   kriyāvattvaṃ na dravyalakṣaṇam, gaganādāv avyāpakatvād iti cet—na, mūrtadravyalakṣaṇatvāt, kriyāvattvena mūrtānāṃ dravyatvam āpādya tannidarśanenākāśādīnām api tadanumānāt V 6.14–15

   The differences here are appreciable; in one respect, however, they may seem at first sight greater than they are: *kriyāvaddravya* and *mūrtadravya* refer to exactly the same group of substances, viz. all but the all-pervasive ether, time, space and souls. V has adopted a more familiar term,[44] which is at the same time slightly briefer.

2. In the commentary on the list of qualities given in VS 1.1.5, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra explains that the *sūtrakāra* uses the singular *pṛthaktvam*, in spite of the fact that there are as many different types of separateness as there are numbers, because he wishes to emphasize that there is a single universal 'separateness-ness' (*pṛthaktvatvajāti*). Not unnaturally, in the long version the question is then asked why the *sūtrakāra* did not similarly use a singular for the preceding items in the list, *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni*.

   atha rūpaṃ rasa ityādy ekavacanaṃ kiṃ na kṛtam iti cet—na, kvacid ekavacanena jātyekatve khyāpite tatsamānanyāyena rūpādijātīnām ekatvasya nirdhārayituṃ śakyatvād iti TS 67.8–10

   kvacid ekatvakhyāpane samānanyāyatayā rūpādyekatvasyāpi śakyāvagamatvān na sarvatraikavacanaprasaṅgaḥ V 3.24–26

   The point made is identical in both versions, but the different wording and syntax allow V to express it in considerably fewer words.

44 The PDhS, for instance, uses the term *mūrtadravya* but not *kriyāvaddravya*, and the same applies for Candrānanda.

3. A subsequent point discussed is the *sūtrakāra*'s choice of the plural *buddhayaḥ* in the same sūtra.

yad vā[45] *buddhaya iti bahuvacanaṃ buddhitvāvāntarapramātva*[46]*sākṣāt-kāratvānumititvasaṃśayatvaviparyayatvādijātibahutvakhyāpanārtham | tena jñānatvāvāntarajātayo na santīti vadantaḥ prābhākarā nirastāḥ* TS 67.14–17

jñānatvavyatiriktā jñānaniṣṭhapramātvasākṣāttvānumititvasaṃśayatvaviparyayatvajātayo na santīti gurumatanirasanārthaṃ buddhaya iti bahuvacanam V 3.26–27

Again the content is substantially the same, but the version in V is somewhat shorter.

4. In the commentary on 1.1.17 (numbered 1.1.18 in Thakur's edition of the short version), *dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyam*,[47] the question arises what new information this sūtra adds to what we already knew from 1.1.8, *dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante*. The redactor of the short version seems to have rewritten the passage almost entirely; as in example 2 above, the objection-answer structure has been abandoned, and the solution given is somewhat different.

dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante (cf. 1.1.8) *iti sūtreṇedaṃ gatārtham iti cet—na, tasya dravyārambhakaniṣṭhadravyārambhakatvādisādharmyapratipādakatvād asya tattaddravyaviśeṣajanyadravyaguṇakarmaniṣṭhatattaddravyaviśeṣajanyatādisādharmyapratipādanārthatvāt | evam uttarasūtre 'pi guṇāś ca guṇāntaram ārabhante* (cf. 1.1.9) *ity anena paunaruktyaṃ pariharaṇīyam iti* TS 121.1–6

dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante (cf. 1.1.8) *iti bahūnāṃ dravyāṇāṃ dravyakāraṇatvam uktam | atra tv ekaikadravyasya dravyaguṇakarmāpekṣayā sāmānyakāraṇatvaṃ pratipādyam | ato na pūrvaparaprakaraṇayoḥ punaruktatvaṃ pariśaṅkanīyam* V 9.13–15

45 In the long version another explanation of the plural is given first: *buddhaya iti bahuvacanaṃ buddhibahutvakhyāpanārtham | tena buddhir ekaiva, buddhibhedavyavahāras tu candrabhedavyavahāravan mithyaiveti māyāvedāntasiddhānto nirastaḥ* TS 67.13–14.

46 °*pramātva*° : MS. °[*pramātṛ*]° Thakur

47 Thus in Thakur's edition of the long version, and in all other recensions of the *sūtrapāṭha*. I am inclined to regard the anomalous word-order *dravyaṃ dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ sāmānyaṃ kāraṇam* of the short version (both the manuscript and Thakur's edition) as an involuntary scribal variation.

5. *tathā hi sattāpekṣayā dravyatvaṃ viśeṣaḥ, tadapekṣayā pṛthivītvādi, tadapekṣayaikadravyaniṣṭho viśeṣaḥ| na* ***cāntyaviśeṣātiriktavyāvartakam asti****, tatrānuvṛttatvānupapatteḥ* TS 175.25–27	*tathā hi sattāpekṣayā dravyatvaṃ viśeṣaḥ, tadapekṣayā pṛthivītvādi, tadapekṣayaikadravyaniṣṭho viśeṣaḥ|* ***tadapekṣayā viśeṣāntaraṃ nāsti****, tatrānuvṛttatvānupapatteḥ* V 15.9–11

In this case no significant alteration of sense has resulted. The formulation of the short version is briefer and continues the structure of the preceding clauses.

On the basis of the evidence, of which I have tried to give a representative selection, it may be concluded that Thakur's hypothesis as to the relationship of the 'anonymous' commentary to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's long commentary is basically correct. His characterization of the former as an abridgement of the latter, retaining especially the portions of direct relevance to the interpretation of the sūtras and omitting many lengthy discussions and digressions, seems to me the only plausible one. Nozawa has remarked that it is also possible that the long commentary is an expanded version of the short one instead (1974, 474(24)). This would be in principle a possibility, but the actual comparison of the two versions has convinced me that it can be ruled out. The on the whole consistent pattern of changes suggest to my mind strongly that it is the long version which is older. For, granted that someone might expand a brief commentary by adding additional discussions and making some changes, why would he bother to regularly substitute longer synonyms or take pains to make the same point with a few more words?[48] Moreover it seems unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should omit to compose one or more opening verses for a commentary on the VS, even a brief one, nor does it seem plausible to me that he should have made the commentary of another author the basis for his own fuller one, following it so faithfully as to hardly omit a word in it, and yet fail to acknowledge the fact; Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is I think too much an original scholar and idiosyncratic thinker for that.

Many of the cases where the two versions seem to differ in substance (as opposed to mere variation, usually slight, in wording) are to be explained as resulting from the defective state in which both have reached us; we have seen that consultation of the original palm-leaf manuscript of the abridged version frequently allows restoration of a text substantially closer to that of the long version, and that similarly the latter often should be corrected to agree with the abridgment. Another factor to be taken into consideration is the possibility that errors were made during the process of abridgement: for instance, in some occasions, the sense of a passage

48 Such a procedure is perhaps just barely conceivable with some writers of this day, but whatever his faults, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was I feel surely free of such objectionable habits.

may have been altered, even perhaps against the intention of the abridger, by the omission of certain sentences or words.

Of course this is only likely if the person responsible for the abridgement was different from Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself, and this forms a separate question that must be considered. Is this indeed the case, and if so is the abridgement none the less roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the commentary—made for instance by a student of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra for his own use—or is it a (much) later recast? This is of importance for our evaluation of the occasional sentences in the abridged version which do not seem to have a counterpart in the full commentary.

Thakur merely remarks on this point that the abridgment 'must have been prepared by Vādīndra himself or some of his followers for those who were interested in the purport of the sūtras and had no aptitude to enter into the abundant discussions in the *Nibandha*' (1960, 27). To settle the matter, if that is possible, would require very close study of the two texts together with the other extant works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, and would in effect almost have to be preceded by re-editing both versions. Unfortunately, considering the condition of the two texts and their transmission, the type of change or error in the shorter version that would point most strongly to the abridgement not being authorial cannot be identified with complete certainty, because it can never be excluded (and is frequently more plausible) that such differences are to be put down to scribal error. Still, if a sufficient number of such changes can be adduced, the case for a non-authorial, and perhaps non-authorized abridgement may become very strong.

Another category of clues that is worth mentioning could be gathered by looking at the linguistic usage of sentences in V which have been rewritten from the corresponding passages of the long version, and sentences in V which seem to have no counterpart there at all. It is possible that the individual style and use of language of the abridger may be detectable.[49]

49 I shall not try and pursue this approach seriously here, but may point out a single instance where a word only found in the abridged version seems slightly suspect. In the commentary on 1.1.4, *guṇāś ca guṇāntaram* (Thakur wrongly prints *guṇāntaram* as belonging to the commentary in his edition of V), the shorter version has abridged a discussion of various optional interpretations (including one in which the sūtra is divided into two independent ones). The only alternatives offered in the short version concern the interpretation of the sūtra's *ca*, and are expressed as follows: *cakārasya dvau vilāsaviṣayau | tatraikaḥ—na kevalaṃ dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante kiṃ tu guṇā api, dravyārambhakasaṃyogeśvarajñānādīnāṃ paṭādidravyajanakatvād iti | anyas tu guṇe guṇāntaraṃ ceti* (V 5.6–8). The only words here which are found literally in the long version are *na kevalaṃ dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante kiṃ tu guṇā api, dravyārambhakasaṃyogeśvarajñānādīnāṃ paṭādidravyajanakatvāt*. The word, or phrase, which I find suspicious is *cakārasya dvau* ***vilāsaviṣayau***: it is not found, as far as I see, elsewhere in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writing. Even the word *vilāsa* does not seem to occur, and the way chosen to express the existence of two alternatives is altogether rather untypical of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's very regular

Personally, without such large-scale and careful comparisons having been carried out as yet, I feel that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself probably had little or nothing to do with the preparation of the abridged version; for one thing, it seems to me 'out of character' for him to have done so. If this is true, it implies that the rare differences in V which affect the substance have no claim to representing changes in authorial intention. This does not imply that V should not be regarded as a 'version' of the long commentary, just as the text of a novel altered against the author's intentions at some points by a publisher's editor should still be regarded as a version of the author's text, and as an important witness to his intentions.[50] In any case the relationship between the two is so close and so clear that it is surprising to find it described merely with the words '[b]oth works are indebted to Udayana and use similar versions of the Sūtra text' (Halbfass 1992, 84 n.25).[51]

To conclude this section, I may observe that far from there being any discernible change in the style of the abridged commentary at the point where the text of the long version as we have it breaks off, it shows a high degree of consistency with the earlier portions and with the style of writing and thought that we find in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's other works. Certain turns of phrase occur which are highly typical of our author, and ideas and arguments surface which I have been only able to find in the writings of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.[52] In short, I see no reason to doubt that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra finished his lengthy commentary on the VS, and that the later portions of the abridged version are as faithful to it as the first two *adhyāya*s are.

style.

50 Once again it may be remarked that the difference between alterations introduced by an editor, redactor or abridger and those made by a 'mere' scribe is frequently a gradual one at best (cf. footnote 38 on p. 15 above).

51 Also in the other passages of this important book where Halbfass refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, it appears that he regards it as a completely different text from the abridged version. Thus on p. 75, he speaks of 'several apparently older commentaries: that is Candrānanda's *Vṛtti*, Bhaṭṭavādīndra's *Vārttika*, and the anonymous commentary edited by Anantalal Thakur,' and on p. 79 he calls the abridged version 'an anonymous *Vyākhyā*, which may be several centuries older than the *Upaskāra*.' Nowhere does Halbfass give his reasons, if there are any, for differing from Thakur's judgement.

In further consideration of this subject it may perhaps be unavoidable to reflect on both ancient Indian and our modern concepts of 'versions of a text': when would an Indian author have considered a redaction a 'different text' and when should we? I have refrained from discussion of this sort of question, though not because I find them useless.

52 Cf. e.g. footnote 19 on p. 103 below.

1.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought

My interest in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary originally arose through the importance of the *sūtrapātha* it contains for the study of the much vexed problems of the VS. There are however other reasons why it deserves notice, and one of these is the light it casts on its author's thought.[53] Before turning to the technical details of the edition presented here, something should be said about this. What is our author's importance as a philosopher, what, if any, are his contributions to the Vaiśeṣika, what influences does he show, and what influence did he have on his successors? These are questions which one has every right to ask of someone undertaking to edit even a small portion of his writings, and I shall make some attempt to deal with them here, although unfortunately I am only able to answer them in part, and with reservations. This may perhaps be pardoned, if the reader will bear in mind that to answer these questions with authority would require not merely familiarity with the works of our author himself but also an understanding of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika and their historical development, to say nothing of the other 'schools' with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra shows himself to be well acquainted,[54] far beyond mine. Nor are there many studies which would be of help in such a project:[55] as Potter justly observed almost twenty years ago, 'this post-Udayana, pre-Gaṅgeśa period has not been studied nearly as extensively as that prior to Udayana' (1977, 8).[56]

53 Yet another is the references to, sometimes quotations from, works which have been lost to us, such as the commentary on the VS by Ātreya. Cf. p. 37f. below.

54 Explicit references to other authors or 'schools' in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings may be found with the index given in Appendix 4; see also p. 36ff. below.

55 As far as I can see, very little has been written about Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought. Telang's useful introduction to his edition of the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* devotes but little space to the content of the work (see especially pp. ix–x and xvi-xvii). Gopinath Kaviraj does not go further than to say that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra 'was one of the greatest polemic writers in the field of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika in mediaeval India and deserves to be ranked, so far as dialectical abilities are concerned, with Śrīharṣa and similar other writers.' (1961, 29): an encomium the value of which surely depends much on just who and how many the 'similar other writers' are. He also thinks that the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* 'was perhaps the *magnum opus* of this gifted author and created quite a sensation in his time. His great controversialistic genius appears at its best in his [sic: read this?] work, where he attempts to prove the futility and defects of the so-called *mahāvidyā* syllogisms, which played an important part in the history of mediaeval Indian Logic' (1961, 30). No attempt at an overall evaluation of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's work is made in Potter 1977.

56 In fact, even Udayana himself has by no means been studied as thoroughly as he deserves, given his acknowledged stature and historical importance. Chemparathy's work, especially the 1972 monograph, represents the best in Udayana studies, I would judge, but though Udayana's theology is certainly important and central to his thought, many other areas remain virtually unexplored. Indeed, with what is sometimes judged to be his most important work, the *Tātparyapariśuddhi*, still not published in its entirety, a definitive assessment of Udayana's philosophy is perhaps not possible at present.

With such a dearth of serious investigations of important predecessors of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra such as Vallabhācārya and Vādivāgīśvara, it is a difficult project to place Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought into historical perspective, and one which, if seriously attempted, would quickly outgrow the limits which must be imposed here.

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's three works which survive at least in part, briefly surveyed above, each have their particular character. The *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* is the only 'independent' work, in the sense that it is not a commentary on an older text. It has, however, by far the most narrow and specialized topic, one too which is not directly connected with the main themes of the Vaiśeṣika, and it is at the same time the work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's which has been summarized in most detail,[57] so I shall devote no special attention to it here. The two commentaries differ considerably in character; a difference which is to no little extent determined by the nature of the works commented on. The *Kiraṇāvalī* is a mature work by a philosopher with a strong individuality and analytic capacity, written in prose which is admittedly difficult and sometimes elliptical but with a style which is in a long tradition of śāstric commentaries. Udayana's views are pronounced and, on most points, clear enough to one trained in the texts of the school; there is admittedly much for a commentator to explain, but no very great scope for him to read theories of his own into the root-text. And what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does is indeed for the most part the work of a faithful, and it must be said a good commentator.

With the VS, matters are of course very different. The sūtras by no means cover all the themes which had come to be important elements of Vaiśeṣika by the period after Udayana, and they are of course couched in language and syntax which is elliptical and frequently very obscure. Here there is ample room for the development of the commentator's own view, whether by various exegetical strategems by which a sūtra can be read as conveying a sense unlikely to be the original one, or by means of digressions. We find Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra using both methods at various places. As the latest surviving work of the author, it is also not unreasonable to expect that it contains his final, or at least most developed thoughts on various topics which were discussed elsewhere in his writings.

It is therefore this last work of his to which one should look first in order to determine the particular nature of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought. And indeed, many of the most interesting and original of our author's ideas are found more or less clearly expressed in this commentary alone. Those that come up in the abridged commentary on the sixth and seventh *adhyāyas* are briefly discussed in the annotation to the

57 Aside from the very brief account of the contents given by Telang in his introduction to the edition (1920, xvi–xvii), there is a more detailed review of the text in Solomon 1976, 325–331 and a summary by E. Sreekrishna Sarma on p. 648–652 of Potter 1977.

translation below.[58] Here I shall attempt a brief survey of some important points, basing myself in the first place on the VS commentary and emphasizing elements which may be original in our author. After that a few notes—they are no more—are given on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's relationship with some predecessors and his influence on later authors.

1.4.1 Ontology

Like most Vaiśeṣika authors later than Praśastapāda, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra accepts seven categories as fundamental, adding *abhāva* to the six that were alone recognized by Praśastapāda.[59] With regard to the status of the first three, substance, quality and motion,[60] Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has no fundamental innovations, but his treatment of universals, or rather of the highest universal 'reality'[61] in particular, shows a radical departure from the earlier conception. All known earlier writers hold it virtually as an axiom that universals can occur/inhere only in substances, qualities and actions; the VS itself, though we shall see that its statements are not explicit enough to deter Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra from differing, contains passages that support this view.[62] This led them into a conflict between the view on the one hand that reality is a universal, and

58 Perhaps the most noteworthy points are Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's espousal of *piṭharapākavāda* rather than the *pīlupākavāda* normally associated with Vaiśeṣika (cf. the commentary on 7.1.5–16) and his subdivision of *saṃyogajasaṃyoga* (cf. the commentary on 7.2.12). In addition to these, there are numerous more minor points where he differs from the other commentators on the explanation of a sūtra.

59 See for instance *tasmād upayogitvād dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyābhāvarūpaṃ prameyaṃ vyutpādanīyam iti siddham* (TS 59.13–14).

60 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra explicitly rejects Bhāsarvajña's proposal that motion is a quality, and not a separate category: one of the interpretations he gives of the word *aguṇam* in the sūtra defining action (1.1.16 in Thakur's edition of the TS ≈ 1.1.17 in his edition of the abridged commentary) is that it is aimed at denying such a view: *yad vā karma guṇa iti bhūṣaṇaḥ | tannirāsārtham uktam aguṇam iti, na guṇa aguṇam iti vyākhyānāt* (TS 115.22–23). This is followed by some logical arguments to prove that motion is not a quality; unfortunately Thakur's transcript is lacunose here, so that not all details can be followed. It is clear enough though that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra gives the 'explicit refutation of the Bhūṣaṇakāra's view that motion is a quality' that Potter (1977, 131) was unable to find in other Nyāya or Vaiśeṣika texts. Nor was he the first to do so, for Udayana also mentions Bhāsarvajña's radical view and rejects it with arguments—different, it seems, from Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's—in the *Kiraṇāvalī* (104.21–105.5).

61 I have adopted the translation for *sattā* or *bhāva* that Halbfass prefers, to avoid confusing readers accustomed to his terminology.

62 For instance the discussion of *bhāva* at VS 1.2.7–13, makes it clear to a reader not strongly biased in favour of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's theory that 'the Vaiśeṣikasūtra ascribes *sattā* or *bhāva* to the first three categories (*dravya, guṇa, karman*) only' (Halbfass 1992, 143). 8.1.6 (8.5 in Candrānanda's version), *sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam*, also poses some problems for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra: for his solution see p. 28 below.

on the other hand that not only the substances, qualities and motions in which that universal occurs but also the remaining categories 'exist' in an objective sense.[63] Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, however, does not agree, and offers a more radical solution to the difficulty, holding that the universal 'being' occurs in all the categories. This is a recurrent theme in his commentary on the VS, but it appears first and is argued at greatest length in the commentary on the word *sat* in 1.1.7 *sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ*.[64]

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra explains the *sat* of the sūtra as referring to *sattva*,[65] equates this with *astitva* and says that it is a property that exists in all the categories and may be known through direct perception.[66] He sees no problem in equating this also with *sattā*, and denies that it cannot occur in universals and so on.[67] Even in *astitva* itself *astitva* occurs, apparently despite of the *ātmāśraya* that this amounts to.[68]

It is obvious that this proposal would raise a storm of protest from more traditional Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas, and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra deals at some length with a number of possible objections. I shall give only a sample of his arguments.

The most fundamental objection, the first also that is likely to occur to one, is that if this *astitva* is a real universal, it should not occur in universals, and certainly not in itself, because this would lead to an infinite regress.[69] When this is urged against him, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first remarks that the occurrence of *astitva* in lower universals such as *dravyatva* leads to no such infinite regress. As for the *astitva* of *astitva*, he seems to have a two-fold answer; one may give up the idea (in contradiction to his own earlier espousal of it) or one may instead defend it by not admitting

63 The most important study of this problem and some of the ways in which the Vaiśeṣika attempted to deal with it is of course Halbfass' 1992 monograph; see especially chapter 6.

64 The theory put forward by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in his commentary to this sūtra seems to me so unusual and radical a departure from his predecessors that it is surprising that Halbfass merely refers to it as being 'of interest' for 'the adjustments of Praśastapāda's ontological vocabulary that were introduced after Udayana' (1992, 159; the footnote on this passage, number 118 on p. 168, refers directly to the pages of the long version of the VS commentary which are my basis here but describes their content merely as 'on *sattā, astitva, bhāvatva*, etc.').

65 *sad iti bhāvapradhāno nirdeśaḥ, sattvam ity arthaḥ* TS 68.20.

66 *sattvam astitvaṃ sakalapadārthaniṣṭho dharmaviśeṣaḥ | tatra kiṃ pramāṇam iti cet—pratyakṣam eva* TS 68.24–25.

67 *athāstitvaṃ sattaiva, sā ca dravyaguṇakarmasv eva vartate | sāmānyādiṣu punar astīti pratyayo bhrāntir iti cet—na, bādhakābhāvāt | na hi sāmānyādayo na santīti bādhakam udeti* TS 68.25–26.

68 *nanv astitvam astitve vartate vā na vā | prathama ātmāśrayaḥ, dvitīye 'stitvasya sakalapadārthavṛttitvānupapattiḥ, svasmād eva vyāvṛttatvād iti | na, astitve 'py astitvāṅgīkārāt* TS 68.33–69.2.

69 'It [i.e. *sattā*] cannot be the substrate of reality or any other real universal, as this would entail an infinite regress (*anavasthā*), which classical Vaiśeṣika regards as a fatal defect' (Halbfass 1992, 144).

that this type of infinite regress is sufficient to refute it because there is no 'destruction of the basis' (*mūlakṣati*),[70] i.e., presumably, because the 'first-level' *astitva* is established by perception.[71]

The next serious problem addressed is how *astitva* is related with (the category) inherence, which is taught explicitly to be one in both the VS and the PDhS. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first claims that the universal *astitva* is related to inherence by inherence itself (it inheres in inherence), and finds this self-relation unproblematic.[72] Alternatively, he is willing to admit a second inherence relating *astitva* to the first one, and itself related by that first inherence to *astitva*. The mutual dependency (*parasparāśraya*) this entails is again not admitted to be a fault here, as it does not prevent the entities involved from arising (i.e. existing) and being known.[73] Or even if yet another inherence is needed (to relate *astitva* to the second one), this is unproblematic, for the first inherence can then be used to relate the third with *astitva*. The circularity (*cakraka*) involved is of course not a fault, as it does not prevent the entities involved from arising (i.e. existing) and being known. Similarly Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is

70 For the idea that *anavasthā* is not a serious fault so long as there is no *mūlakṣati* cf. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *anavasthāpi caivaṃ na* ***mūlaghātinī*** | . . . ***mūlakṣatikarīm*** *āhur anavasthāṃ hi dūṣaṇam* | *mūlasiddhau tv arucyāpi nānavasthā nivāryate* || NM I 58.9–12.

71 *athāstitvaṃ jātir dharmāntaraṃ vā* | *jātir iti brūmaḥ* | *jātyādau jāter asambhava iti cet—na, bādhakābhāvāt* | *jātau jātisvīkāre 'navasthā bādhakam iti cet—na, dravyatvādāv astitvāṅgīkāre 'navasthāyā nirūpayitum aśakyatvāt* | *astitve 'py astitvāntaraṃ tatrāpy astitvāntaram ity anavastheti cet—na, astitve 'stitvānaṅgīkārāt, mūlakṣater abhāvenaivaṃvidhānavasthāyā dūṣaṇatvenānaṅgīkārāc ca* TS 69.22-26. Perhaps the text should be regarded as suspect here: it seems strange that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should consider giving up the assumption of the occurrence of *astitva* in *astitva*—moreover, if my interpretation of the passage is accurate one would expect *vā* in place of the final *ca*. I do not see a plausible way to emend the passage though.

72 *samavāye jātisvīkāre sambandhābhāvo bādhaka iti cet—na, samavāyābhāvayor viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvasambandhāṅgīkārāt* | *samavāye jātisvīkāre samavāyābhāvo bādhaka iti cet—na, samavāye 'pi samavāyasambhavāt* | *samavāyāntarasvīkāre tatrāpi samavāyāntaram ity anavastheti cet—na, tasyaiva samavāyasya tatrāṅgīkārāt* | *ātmāśrayaḥ syād iti cet—astu, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāva ātmāśrayasya dūṣaṇatvānaṅgīkārāt* TS 69.26–31.

73 *astu vā samavāye samavāyāntaram, tathāpi nānavasthā, dvitīye samavāye prathamasamavāyasyaiva svīkārāt* | *na caivaṃ parasparāśrayadoṣaḥ, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve parasparāśrayasyāpi doṣatvānaṅgīkārāt* TS 70.4.
I am not completely certain what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra means to convey with *utpattijñaptipratibandhakābhāve*. The word is one which he uses on several occasions, always, as far as I can see, as an argument to show that *ātmāśraya*, *parasparāśraya*, *cakraka* or *anavasthā* does not form a fault that can discredit a theory (aside from the occurrences in our passage here see TS 75.28, 81.23 and 151.24; at TS 69.2 we find the clearly synonomous *utpattipramitipratibandhakatvābhāvena*). It appears to be related to *mūlakṣatyabhāva* (cf. footnote 70 above): this is born out by an occurrence in Śrīvidyācakravartin's commentary *Sampradāyaprakāśinī* on Mammaṭa's *Kāvyaprakāśa*. Apropos of Mammaṭa's line *evam apy* ***anavasthā*** *syād yā* ***mūlakṣayakāriṇī*** (and the auto-commentary hereon) this commentator remarks ***utpattijñaptyor anyatarapratibandhakatvābhāve hi nānavasthādoṣaḥ***, *yathā bījāṅkurādau* (KP 41.34–35).

willing to posit if necessary a fourth, a fifth, or even an infinite regress and thus an infinite number of inherences; all this is by his criteria not enough to render his basic premise, the existence of the universal *astitva/sattā* in all categories, invalid.[74]

Objections are next raised and answered with regard to the occurrence of *sattā* in the categories of ultimate individuators and non-existence; I shall pass over these here. The final difficulty to be surmounted is that posed by VS 8.1.6.[75] *sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam* (cf. footnote 62 above). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has an ingenious answer, for he says that with the word *sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt* Kaṇāda only prohibits lower universals (i.e. such as *dravyatva*), and not *sattā*, from inhering in (lower) universals. In support of this interpretation he remarks that if this had not been the intention of the sūtra it would have sufficed to have said *sāmānyābhāvāt*, and thereby prohibited all universals from occuring in universals, and thus the addition of *viśeṣa* in the compound would have no function.[76]

Herewith Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra claims to have fully established his point: *astitva* is identical with the highest universal *sattā* and is common to all categories. He even quotes a sentence from Praśastapāda's PDhS which he believes supports this.[77]

What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does here is attempt to solve an inherent difficulty in Vaiśeṣika ontology by equating what originally was a 'second-order concept,'[78] which

74 *astu vā dvitīyasamavāye 'pi samavāyāntaram | tathā ca nānavasthā, tṛtīyasamavāye prathamasamavāyasyaivāṅgīkārāt | na caivaṃ cakrakadoṣaḥ, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve cakrakasyādūṣaṇatvāt | evaṃ caturthapañcamasamavāyābhyupagame 'pi nānavasthā | astu vānavasthā, tathāpi nāsau doṣaḥ, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve 'navasthāyā apy adūṣaṇatvāt | samavāyānantyaprasaṅga iti cet—na, iṣṭatvād iti* TS 70.14–19.

75 Omitted in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, and for that reason also in Thakur's edition thereof.

76 *jātiṣu sattāṅgīkāre sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata* eva jñānam iti sūtravirodha iti cet—na, sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvād ity anena sāmānyaviśeṣam avāntaraṃ sāmānyaṃ niṣedhatā sattāyā aniṣedhāt | anyathā sāmānyābhāvād ity etāvataiva sāmānyaniṣedhe siddhe sūtragataviśeṣapadavaiyarthyāpatter iti* | TS 70.34–71.4.
* *tata*: em., *tat* Thakur

77 *tat siddhaṃ sattājātir evāstitvaṃ sakalapadārthasādharmyam iti | yad uktaṃ praśastapādabhāṣyakāraiḥ—sā* cānuvṛtter eva hetutvāt sāmānyam eveti* (PDhS 11.13–14) TS 71.5–7.
* *sā*: em., *sa* Thakur

78 It may be worth saying something here about the role of *astitva* in Praśastapāda's ontology, and for this I can do no better than to quote Halbfass: 'Unlike *sattā*, *astitva* covers not only substances, qualities, and motions, but also universals, particularities, and inherence. As a common attribute (*sādharmya*) of all six categories, it is coordinate, but not necessarily coextensive with *jñeyatva* ("knowability") and *abhidheyatva* ("nameability"). Its most basic connotation seems to be irreducible identity, identifiability, and accordingly, undeniability... Praśastapāda does not explain the word *astitva*, and he uses it only once in his extant work, the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*... *Astitva* is not part of the fundamental "nomenclature of the world." It is not "listed" and "named" among the categories, but used to describe and analyze them. It is a second-order concept, an abstraction. Praśastapāda sees no reason to explain this instrument of analysis and description' (1992, 144–145). On the ways in which Praśastapāda's commentators tried to come

fell outside of the supposedly all-inclusive categories, with the highest universal. This attempt to make the description and classification of really existing things as complete as possible with a small set of first-order concepts and avoiding the use of concepts at a higher (meta-) level as far as possible, inevitably entails infinite regress, circularity or *ātmāśrayaḥ* at some key points; how persuasive Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is in arguing that this does not invalidate his proposals I shall leave to philosophers to debate. No Indian thinker, as far as I know, has followed Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in this.

1.4.2 Epistemology

Like all other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra accepts as means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*) direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) and inference (*anumāna*). There is unfortunately no systematic discussion of the number and nature of the means of valid knowledge in the surviving corpus, but it emerges from a reading of the VS commentary that he also regards verbal authority (*śabda*) as an independent *pramāṇa*.[79] I do not assume this merely because of various references to the authority (*prāmāṇya*) of pronouncements of God (in the Veda) and other teachers such as Kaṇāda, for this is of course admitted by other Vaiśeṣikas and need not imply that this authority is an independent one—it is usually regarded as being a form of inference. But there are many passages which point in a much clearer and more definite fashion to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's acceptance of three independent *pramāṇas*. To mention but a few: at one place we read . . . *ity atra pramāṇaṃ nāsti, pratyakṣānumānāgamāsambhavāt, pramāṇāntarasya cānaṅgīkārāt*.[80] At another we find *yata evātmani pratyakṣam anumānaṃ vā na pramāṇam, ata evāgamaḥ pramāṇam* (V 40.22–23); admittedly this is an opponent's suggestion, but the ground on which it is rejected is not that the underlying presupposition about the number of distinct *pramāṇas* is mistaken.

A compact review of the various types of perceptual knowledge is presented in the (abridged) commentary on VS 3.1.13 (numbered 3.1.20 in Thakur's edition). The division on the highest level is that between perception accompanied by conceptualization (*savikalpaka*) and without conceptualization (*nirvikalpaka*). The first is

to terms with the concept see Halbfass 1992, 154–158.

79 This is admittedly a view not usually associated with the Vaiśeṣika, but Vyomaśiva also holds it.

80 TS 158.5. The words that precede this, which should tell us in regard to what there is no *pramāṇa*, seem unfortunately to be corrupt, or rather something appears to have been lost, possibly due to eyeskip. On the strength of the context something like *bahubhyaḥ karmabhyaḥ saṃyogavibhāgau bhavataḥ* could be supplied.

a direct apprehension which has as its object something as qualified by something else, and is subdivided according to the ontological category to which the qualifier belongs.[81] The second is direct apprehension which does not have as its object something as qualified by something else; the example given is the cognition that arises first, i.e. immediately after the contact between the sense-organ and its object, and which gives rise to the subsequent *savikalpaka* cognitions.[82]

Doubtless it is in logic that most might be expected from our author. However, as far as I can see, there is in fact no coherent and thorough treatment of the general theory of inference in the works that we have. The *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* is of course a highly specialized treatise, and I shall not take it up for discussion here.[83] No doubt the collection of the various scattered discussions of individual logical problems and syllogisms together with an examination of the numerous syllogisms put forward on virtually every page of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings would be a worthwhile task, but it is one which I am more than happy to leave to a specialist in (Indian) logic. The only passage to which I shall briefly draw attention is in the abridged commentary on 3.1.10 (numbered 3.1.17 in Thakur's edition), where a short paragraph is devoted to a general discussion of inference; if we had the corresponding section of the full version I suspect we might well find an almost book-length treat-

81 There is an interesting point to be noted here, though it does not admit of a definitive solution at present. In the manuscript we read that this sub-division is sevenfold (*tac ca saptavidhaṃ*), but the text continues by giving exemples of only five types, according to whether the qualifier is a substance, a quality, a motion, a universal or an absence. Thakur has accordingly emended *saptavidhaṃ* to *pañcavidham*, understandably enough. However as a textual critic I find it more plausible that the *saptavidhaṃ* is correct—it is more likely that two cases have been lost from the list than that *pañcavidham* should have been altered to produce the inconsistency. Simple mechanical error is conceivable as a cause, for four of the five examples we have end with *ityādi* (possibly the sole exception should be emended to agree with this). But it seems potentially significant that the two missing items are the two most problematic ones; we expect examples of cognition of something as qualified by an ultimate individuator and as qualified by inherence. The omission could therefore possibly be an intentional one, though the *saptavidhaṃ* remained, presumably overlooked, to point to the original state of affairs. Cognitions of the type that I suspect should be added are possible, though probably only to God or to yogins.

82 *tad* (scil. *pratyakṣam* or *pratyakṣajñānam*) *dvividham—savikalpakaṃ nirvikalpakaṃ ceti| viśiṣṭaviṣayaḥ sākṣātkāraḥ savikalpakam| tac ca saptavidham*—kiṃcid dravyaviśiṣṭaviṣayaṃ yathā daṇḍī devadatta ityādi, kiṃcid guṇaviśiṣṭaviṣayaṃ yathā śuklo ghaṭa ityādi, kiṃcit karmaviśiṣṭaviṣayaṃ yathā devadattaś calatīti, kiṃcit sāmānyaviśiṣṭaviṣayaṃ yathā gaur ityādi, kiṃcid abhāvaviśiṣṭaviṣayaṃ yathā ghaṭaśūnyaṃ bhūtalam ityādi| viśiṣṭaviṣayatvarahitaḥ sākṣātkāro nirvikalpakaṃ yathā prathamaṃ viśiṣṭasākṣātkārajanajadravyādijñānam* V 37.14–20.

* *saptavidham*: MS, [*pañca*]*vidham* Thakur. Cf. the previous note. I have not attempted to supply the two examples which I presume must have been omitted.

83 As already remarked, it is the only work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's of which three moderately detailed summaries are available: cf. footnote 57 on p. 24 above.

ment. As it stands, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra divides inference in the customary way into inference 'for one's self' and 'for others.' The former is independent of a formulation with the five 'members,' and only requires that one grasp the concomitance between logical ground and property to be inferred (*vyāpti*) and the fact that the logical ground is a property that belongs to the object with regard to which the inference operates (*pakṣadharmatā*). Inference 'for others,' however, consists of the well-known five members, of which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra argues that all serve a purpose; therefore the Buddhists and Vādivāgīśvara who claim that inference 'for others' requires only two parts (corresponding to the *pratijñā* and *upanayana*) are wrong, for without knowing what the property-possesor, property to be proved and logical ground and so on are (which it is the function of the other three parts of the syllogism to make known) *vyāpti* and *pakṣadharmatā* cannot be cognized.[84]

Of *śabda* or *āgama* too, and of what criteria there are for reliability of a source of verbal knowledge, I am unable to find a really systematic account. But there are passages from which it appears that the authority of Kaṇāda, for instance, is known primarily because he makes statements which can be tested and veridicated by other *pramāṇas*: it is this that lends his pronouncements authoritative status also in the cases where other *pramāṇas* cannot operate.[85] This is no different from the way the Naiyāyikas (and Vyomaśiva) see things; if pressed, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra would presumably explain that the fact that we may use inference to establish that someone is an authoritative person (*āpta*) does not mean that that person's statements and the knowledge they generate can be subsumed under inference.

1.4.3 Theology and soteriology

I find no comprehensive treatment of theology in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works as we have them; one has the impression that the doctrine of God was not as central a con-

84 *tad idam anumānaṃ dvividham—svārthaṃ parārthaṃ ca* | [*tatra svārthaṃ*] *pañcāvayavavākyanirapekṣam avagatavyāptipakṣadharmatāviśiṣṭam* | *parārthaṃ pratijñāhetudṛṣṭāntopanayanāny avayavāḥ* | *avayavatvaṃ caiṣāṃ vākyaikadeśatvenopacārāt* | *na ca pratijñā niṣprayojanā, parvato vahnimān ity asya parvato na vahnirahito bādhād ityevaṃparatvāt* | *na ca hetuvacanasya niṣprayojanatvam, dhūmavattvasādhanatvakhyāpakatvena saprayojanatvāt* | *nāpi dṛṣṭāntavacanasya niṣprayojanatvam, vyāptidhījanakatvena saprayojanatvāt* | *saugatavādivāgīśvarādayas tu yo dhūmavān asāv agnimān yathā mahānasaḥ, dhūmavāṃś ca parvata ity avayavadvayam eva prayoktavyam ity āhuḥ* | *tad ayuktam, dharmisādhyasādhanādyapratītau vyāptipakṣadharmatvayor avagantum aśakyatvāt* V 36.16–24.

85 Cf. e.g. *etāvanty eva dravyāṇīty atra kiṃ pramāṇam iti cet—sūtrakāravacanam eva* | *na** *tat pramāṇam iti cet—na, abādhitānubhavajanakatvasya prāmāṇyasya kaṇādavacanatvenāgnyuṣṇatā*** *pratipādakakaṇādavacanavad anumānāt* TS 63.4–6.
* *na*: em., om. Thakur ** °*uṣṇatā*°: em., °*uṣṇaka*° Thakur

cern for him as it is for Udayana, and unlike his illustrious predecessor our author shows I believe little sign of personal devotion. Nonetheless, problems connected with God, His qualities, and His interaction with men and other existing things inevitably come up not infrequently in the VS commentary, which after all ranges through virtually all the topics of Vaiśeṣika philosophy. In most of these occasional discussions there is nothing that goes against Udayana's theology, but there are passages which reveal that, again, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra holds some views that seem to be unique.

God (*īśvara*, *parameśvara* or *mahādeva*) is for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as for other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas, Śiva, who periodically creates and destroys the universe[86] and who, by means of his qualities, is a cause of everything in it (cf. e.g. the commentary on 6.1.7 and footnote 26 on p. 85 below). Aside from this function as Creator, He interacts with the world of men above all in His role as teacher; He is the *dharmopadeṣṭṛ* for everyone (cf. e.g. the commentary to 6.2.2), whether directly, in the case of favoured sages such as Kaṇāda, or via the body of teachings of which He is the author, alone, as He is of the Veda, or together with a human teacher, as of the VS (cf. footnote 27 on p. 9 above). It is also God who at creation teaches the conventions of language (i.e. Sanskrit) to the first men, who have no human *vṛddhas* to learn from (cf. the commentary on 6.1.3 and footnote 18 on p. 82). I find no mention of God as teacher of other human usages (cf. Chemparathy 1972, 95–97), but doubtless Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra would have agreed that this too is one of His works.

Thus far there is nothing extraordinary. It is when we come to the question of the qualities of the Lord that we encounter Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's unconventional views. The positions we find in other Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya authors as to the number of qualities of God may be briefly summarized as follows.[87] Pakṣilasvāmin ascribes to God the qualities *dharma*, *jñāna*, *samādhi* and *aiśvarya*, betraying, as Chemparathy justly remarks (1971, 169), influence of Sāṃkhya-Yoga conceptions of God. Praśastapāda, though his surviving work is not completely explicit on the subject, probably admitted at least eight qualities in God (Chemparathy 1971, 170–171): the five general qualities belonging to all substances (number, size, separateness, conjunction and disjunction) and those of cognition, desire and effort/will (*prayatna*). Uddyotakara ascribed to God six qualities (the five general ones plus cognition), but shows an inconsistency in elsewhere also attributing desire and *aiśvarya* to Him (Chemparathy 1971, 172–173 and 178–179). The large majority of Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas however held that He has eight qualities, viz. those which Praśastapāda

86 It should be understood that destruction consists of the dissolution of all constructed things; the eternal substances—ether, time, space, souls and the atoms—are not destroyed.

87 I draw on the convenient and reliable survey given in Chemparathy 1971; cf. also Chemparathy 1972, 179–182.

probably attributed to him: the five general ones, cognition, desire and *prayatna*. Only Jayanta Bhaṭṭa adds to these *dharma* and pleasure, arriving at a total of ten qualities in the Lord (Chemparathy 1971, 175–176 and 179–180).

We find Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's view on the qualities of God most clearly expressed in the course of a discussion in the long version of the commentary on VS 1.1.3. Having maintained that the Veda is pronounced by God who takes on a body for that purpose,[88] Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra imagines an opponent asking for clarification of this notion of God's body, presenting three possibilities, all of which are said to be problematic. If any body which is directly governed by God's will (*prayatna*) may be called God's body,[89] then even the body of a non-authoritative person (*anāpta*) could be a body of God, since all things are the object of God's direct will, so this feature would be inconclusive (i.e. it would not be the case that what is spoken by God in an embodied form would be automatically authoritative).[90] If a body of God is that with which He has experience (*bhogāyatana*), this would lead to the absurd consequence that God would experience pleasure and suffering. If it is the locus of sense-organs that produce God's cognitions, it would follow, undesirably, that God has cognitions which are produced.[91] To this Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's answer is a surprising one; rather than choosing to defend the first of these options, as Udayana does, he appears to accept simultaneously the second and the third, and the consequences which go with them. He admits that the Lord has produced, non-eternal cognition[92] as well as pleasure and suffering (produced for instance respectively through union with and separation from the Goddess his consort); after all the Purāṇas speak of the embodied Lord as having all these. To the objection that the Lord having no *dharma* and *adharma* surely He cannot have pleasure and suffering, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra coolly

88 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra merely uses the word *śarīra*, not, as Udayana does, *upakaraṇaśarīra* or *nirmāṇakāya* (cf. Chemparathy 1972, 152).

89 This appears to be Udayana's position, when essentially the same three *vikalpas* are discussed in the *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. See Chemparathy 1972, 143.

90 It is of course this question of authority that underlies the entire discussion.

91 For Udayana this would be unacceptable—God's cognitions must be unproduced and eternal; see Chemparathy 1972, 166-175.

92 Another passage where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra reiterates this position of his in an even stronger form, denying that God has eternal cognitions, may be found in a long discussion about numbers and their arising in the long commentary ad VS 1.1.24; see . . . *īśvarāpekṣābuddher anityatvāc ca | na caivam īśvare 'nityajñānāpattiḥ, iṣṭatvāt | na caivam īśvare nityajñānābhyupagamavirodhaḥ, nityajñānasyānabhyupagamāt | na* caivaṃvidhāpekṣābuddhau pramāṇābhāvaḥ, etatparamāṇvekatvaviṣayaitaddvitīyaparamāṇvekatva**viṣayatvarahitaitadekatvaviṣayaitatparamāṇudvayaikatvavyatiriktaikatvaviṣayatvarahitakāryasākṣātkāraviṣayaḥ, meyatvāt, ghaṭavad ity anumānāt | na ca śarīrādikāraṇābhāvāt parameśvare kāryajñānānutpattiḥ, śarīrāder abhyupagamāt | tathā ca—bhagavantam umākāntaṃ candracūḍaṃ trilocanam | śrutismṛtipurāṇāni vadanti parameśvaram ||* (TS 134.25–32).
* *na*: conj., om. Thakur ** °*paramāṇvekatva*°: em., °*paramāṇvaikatva*° Thakur

replies that he accepts God as having both *dharma* and *adharma* too. Once more it is Purāṇic literature that he adduces as proof, for there we read of Śiva's *dharma* that arises from his *tapas* and his *adharma* resulting from his decapitation of Brahmā.[93]

Another objection: if even God experiences pleasure and suffering and so on, he would be no different from ordinary people such as we are. No, replies Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, the difference is that He cannot have false cognitions, is the agent of creation and destruction, composes the Veda, is Lord over all the worlds and the like. Otherwise (if all this is not admitted to form a difference) one might as well say that a king is no different from the lowest of wretches. All this then being regarded as established, it is now clear also that it is not the case that there is no good reason for God to act as He does in composing the Veda and so on, for it is accepted that He may thereby acquire *dharma*, pleasure and so on.[94]

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra next mentions and rejects the view of Ātreya,[95] who admits God to have *dharma* and a body and pleasure arising therefrom, but does not credit

93 *atha kiṃ sākṣādīśvaraprayatnādhiṣṭhitatvam īśvaraśarīratvam, kiṃ veśvarabhogāyatanatvam, kiṃ veśvarajñānajanakendriyāśrayatvam** | *prathame 'nāptaśarīrasyāpīśvaraśarīratvam, sarvapadārthānāṃ sākṣādīśvaraprayatnaviṣayatvād iti taṭastham evānaikāntikatvam* | *dvitīye parameśvare 'pi sukhaduḥkhāpattiḥ* | *tṛtīye parameśvare kāryajñānādyāpattir iti cet—na, parameśvare*** *girijāsambhogaviyogajanyasukhaduḥkhakāryajñānādyaṅgīkārāt purāṇādau girijāsaṃbhogaviyogajanyaduḥkhendriyajñānādiśālino vigrahavata eva candraśekharasya śravaṇāt* | *dharmādharmābhāve katham īśvarasya sukhaduḥkhādīnīti cet—na, īśvare dharmādharmayor apy aṅgīkārāt, purāṇādau parameśvarasya tapojanyadharmabrahmaśiraśchedajanyādharmayoḥ śravaṇāt* | TS 41.14–23.

* *veśvarajñānajanakendriyāśrayatvam*: conj., *veśvarajñānajanitendriyāśrayatvam* Thakur ** *parameśvare*: MS, *parameśvara*° Thakur

The 'MS' on the basis of which this correction is made is one of the Madras manuscript fragments: about one third of the leaf is gone, so it does not preserve the passage complete.

94 *sukhaduḥkhādimattve parameśvarasyāsmadādibhyaḥ ko viśeṣa** *iti cet—na, abhrāntatvasṛṣṭisaṃhārakartṛtvavedanirmātṛtvasakalabhuvanasvāmitvādikam ity avehi* | *anyathā sukhaduḥkhādimattve rājño 'pi pāmarādibhyo viśeṣo na syāt* | *deśasvāmyaviśiṣṭavanitāsambhogajanyasukhādayaḥ pāmarādibhyo rājño viśeṣā iti cet—na, evaṃ tarhi viśvasvāmyagirijāsambhogajanyasukhādayo rājādibhyaḥ parameśvarasya viśeṣā iti saṃtoṣṭavyam* | *etena vedādinirmāṇe*** *parameśvarasya prayojanābhāva iti pratyuktam, parameśvare vedādinirmāṇajanyadharmasukhāder aṅgīkārād iti**** TS 41.23–29.

* *ko viśeṣa*: MS, [*na*] *ko 'pi viśeṣa* Thakur ** *vedādinirmāṇe*: MS, *vedanirmāṇe* Thakur *** *aṅgīkārād iti*: MS, *aṅgīkārāt* Thakur

The suggestion in this passage that God's activity in composing the Veda and so on may have as its goal his own *dharma* and pleasure, in other words be *svārtha* and not *parārtha*, is quite surprising: it forms yet another significant difference with Udayana's view. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not seem quite consistent in this, however; at least in one of the passages discussing the composition of the VS he claims that the *prayojana* herein is *paragatau svargāpavargau*, and gives as a parallel the activity of God, who is eternally liberated (and hence has nothing that he could require), in composing the Veda. Furthermore God too (together) with Kaṇāda is a composer of the VS. Cf. the second of the passages quoted in footnote 27 on p. 9 above.

95 On Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's references to and citations from this author see p. 37 below.

his having *adharma* and a body and suffering arising therefrom.[96] This is not the case, for on the basis of the Purāṇas and so on his *adharma* and suffering can be established in the same way as his *dharma* and pleasure. In a similar fashion one must also accept that God has mental traces (*saṃskāra*) and aversion as well, so that the conclusion is that He has the qualities cognition, pleasure, suffering, desire, aversion, will, *dharma*, *adharma* and mental traces—in addition presumably to the five general qualities number, size, separateness, conjunction and disjunction which are not mentioned explicitly here but which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra can hardly have rejected as qualities of God.[97]

This is a rather surprising passage to find in the writings of someone who had read the *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. It clearly brings out the difference in temper between Udayana and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra; the latter's conception of God, apparently under the influence of the 'popular' mythology of the Purāṇas, is one in which God's difference from humans has been reduced so far that it is almost only one of degree—He is different from kings in much the same way that kings are different from the lowest of men.

There is little in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's soteriology—a subject which is not treated at length anywhere in the surviving works—that seems worth drawing particular attention to here. Liberation itself he holds with other Vaiśeṣikas to be a state in which the specific qualities of the soul are extirpated; suffering is then absent but pleasure is as well (see the commentary on 6.2.20). Of the path to liberation we find no systematic or detailed account. At different places Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra speaks of various different factors as producing liberation: *dharma* (as in the commentary on 1.1.2), more specifically *yogajadharma*,[98] direct knowledge of the true state of af-

96 Ātreya, if he indeed admitted *dharma* and pleasure as qualities of God, also had a view which appears to have no parallel among the other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas. Though the sentences mentioning and refuting Ātreya's view were quoted by Thakur in his 1969 article (p. 490), he did not draw attention to the unusual nature of the theories of both Ātreya and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

97 *ātreyācāryās** *tu parameśvare dharmatajjanyaśarīrasukhādīni manyante, na tv adharmatajjanyaśarīraduḥkhādīnīti | tad ayuktam, dharmasukhādisādhakadharmigrāhakānumānādipurāṇāder adharmaduḥkhādāv api tulyatvāt | evaṃ smṛtihetusaṃskāradveṣāv api dharmigrāhakānumānādibalāt parameśvare svīkartavyau | tasmāt buddhisukhecchādveṣaprayatnadharmādharmasaṃskāravān parameśvara iti* TS 41.30–34.
* *ātreyācāryās*: MS, *ātreyācāryas* Thakur

98 This comes out in more than one place; for example *ayaṃ* (scil. *muktijanakaguṇaḥ*) *dharmatvādhāraḥ duḥkhājanakagurutvarahitāsmatpratyakṣaniṣṭhaguṇatvāvāntarajātimattvarahitaguṇatvāt,** *vakṣyamāṇasukhajanakavat | na ca*** *sukhajanakatvam upādhiḥ mokṣahetor yogajadharmasyāṣṭamahāsiddhihetutvena sukhajanakatvāṅgīkārāt* (TS 11.18–20).
* °*rahitaguṇatvāt*: em., °*rahitaṃ guṇatvāt* Thakur ** *na ca*: conj., om. Thakur

fairs (*tattvasākṣātkāra*)[99] and direct knowledge of the soul.[100]

God also seems, in some cases at least, to play an important role in the process, if we can take seriously the passage where Kaṇāda is said to have attained all the goals of men, which would include liberation, through the Lord's grace.[101] Also, since He is apparently capable of producing direct awareness in favoured humans such as Kaṇāda, and since it is direct awareness that brings about liberation, it is natural that He should be able to intervene in this way. On the other hand it is quite likely that on this point too Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has not attempted to form a systematic theory.[102]

1.4.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's relation with other philosophers

References to other philosophers or philosophical schools are very numerous in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings; often, though not always, the individual or group that our author has in mind is explicitly named.[103] I confine myself here to a few remarks on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's references to some of his more important predecessors.

Kaṇāda The sage to whom the authorship of the VS is ascribed is always referred to with respect by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, frequently with the term *bhagavān* and once with his name prefixed by *paramapūjya* (GKṬ 60.2). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra regards him as having acquired direct awareness of *dharma* and so on (i.e. *de facto* of everything) through the favour of God, who in the form of an owl taught him the VS and gave him the injunction to teach *dharma* (i.e. by propagating the VS, of which both Kaṇāda and God can be called composer); cf. footnote 27 on pp. 9f. above. In keeping with this view of how the VS was composed, it is the Vaiśeṣika text that comes closest to being regarded as an unquestionable authority by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

99 Cf. e.g. *ayaṃ* (scil. *dharmaḥ*) *gurutvajātirahitaḥ, mokṣajanakatvāt, tattvasākṣātkāravat* TS 10.30–31.

100 Cf. e.g. *yatra na granthasamāptis tatra kathaṃ namaskārajanyadharmavināśaḥ, phalavināśyatvād dharmasyeti cet—nimittakāraṇadehavināśāt, mocakātmasākṣātkārād vā* TS 1.25–27.

101 Cf. *parameśvaraprasādāsāditasakalapuruṣārthasya bhagavataḥ sūtrakārasyātmagāmiphalābhāvāt* TS 8.16–17.

102 Udayana too appears not to have attempted to work out this point thoroughly, but seems on the whole to admit a mediate role of God in bringing about liberation; see for a discussion of this point Chemparathy 1972, 155–156.

103 See the index in Appendix 4 for an attempt at a complete listing. For a much less complete list of references in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works see Thakur 1960, 30–31, and for some remarks on a few of the authors and schools referred to see p. 28–30 of the same article.

In some respects this is little more than lip-service, however; the sūtras lend themselves by their lack of explicitness and clarity to being interpreted in such a way that it is not necessary for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra to disagree with them. Despite this it is interesting, and perhaps a little amusing, to see that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra feels free to question the appropriateness of a sūtra or its wording at a few places.

Praśastapāda The author of the most important systematical text of the Vaiśeṣika is referred to regularly. At some places Praśastapāda is quoted as an authority to justify one of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's statements, even if an unprejudiced reader cannot accept it as likely that Praśastapāda would really have agreed.[104] Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra prefers therefore to read his own views into Praśastapāda's writings, if possible, and thus be able to claim his sanction rather than openly disagree with him. Nonetheless, at a few places we do find a clear statement to the effect that Praśastapāda is mistaken; see for instance the commentary on 7.1.12 below.[105]

An interesting point which emerges from the same commentary passage is that if Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is to be understood literally he must have had access to or knowledge of the contents of a work by Praśastapāda that is no longer available; cf. footnote 28 on p. 107 below.

Ātreya Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS is perhaps the most important source of information on and quotations from the lost commentary by Ātreya on the VS. The references have been collected, with some brief notes, by Thakur in an article presented at the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi 1962, and published in the Proceedings of that conference in 1969. This is a useful source, though the texts quoted should be checked against Thakur's later edition of the *Tarkasāgara*, as there are some discrepancies. In another respect too caution is advised; Thakur includes in the list of passages also some which do not refer to Ātreya by name but only mention a *bhāṣyakāra*. I am far from being completely convinced that these really belong in such a list. Usually it is Praśastapāda who is referred to by this epithet, and although the passages in question (nos. 13 and 16 in Thakur's list) are not found in the PDhS, we have just seen that there are other signs that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may have had access to another work by Praśastapāda. Nor can it be excluded that here some other author yet is meant.

104 Cf. e.g. footnote 77 on p. 28 above.

105 And, for another example, *dravyādīnāṃ pañcānāṃ samavāyitvam anekatvaṃ* [*ca*] *sādharmyam iti praśastapādāḥ* (cf. PDhS 16.18) | *tan na*... TS 81.5–6.

As Thakur remarks (1969, 490) Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra seems never to agree with Ātreya, and in most places explicitly refutes him.

Bhāsarvajña Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra refers to this author and his famous *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* some ten times, as far as I have noted, though never using the name Bhāsarvajña. These references are often critical; they concern Bhāsarvajña's radical proposals to revise Vaiśeṣika ontology. Thus his view that motions are qualities and do not form a separate category (cf. footnote 60 on p. 25 above), and that separateness is not an independent quality (cf. TS 144.28–145.19) are rejected. It is worth remembering though that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's pupil, Bhaṭṭa Rāghava, commented on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra*, admittedly a work which does not stray as clearly from the fold of the orthodox Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika as the auto-commentary *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* does.

Udayana Udayana's influence on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is doubtless great, and the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* shows the respect which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra had for him. Clearly, though, this did not prevent Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra from differing from the *ācārya* often enough. While commenting on the *Kiraṇāvalī* these differences are not often brought to the fore,[106] either out of respect or perhaps because on some points it was only later that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra came to his own independent conclusions. In the commentary on the VS, however, on more than one occasion Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not hesitate to explicitly refute a position of Udayana's,[107] and at one place when a hypothetical opponent raises an objection to a proposition on the grounds that Udayana and others hold an opposite position, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra roundly states that he does not accept 'Udayana and others' as authoritative (*prāmāṇika*).[108]

106 But see for instance the case considered in footnote 19 on pp. 103f. below.

107 E.g. when he writes *udayanādayas tu nyūnādhikasaṃkhyāvyavacchedārthaṃ vibhāgavacanam ity āhuḥ | tad ayuktam, vibhāgavacane pṛthivyādiviśeṣaṇatvena navasaṃkhyānupādānāt tannyūnādhikasaṃkhyāvyavacchedāsambhavāt, pṛthivyādiṣu navasaṃkhyāyā durghaṭatvāc ca* (TS 60.23–25).

108 The point at issue arises in the course of a fascinating discussion in the long version of the commentary on 1.1.3, which starts with the authority of the Veda and wanders via the question of the body assumed by God to produce the Veda to that of the Veda's endurance from creation to dissolution. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra arrives at the position that the sounds and words of the Veda, uttered by God at the time of creation, continue to exist up to the dissolution of the cosmos, though they are not perceived: *etena sṛṣṭyādāv utpannā varṇāḥ padāni yāvat saṃhāram anuvartante, vyañjakābhāvāc ca nopalabhyata iti samādheyam* (TS 44.32–33). This is in contradiction with the ordinary Vaiśeṣika standpoint that sounds and therefore words that are uttered too last but a moment, so an objection is raised—and answered: *varṇapadavākyānām āśutaravināśitvābhyupagamavirodha iti cet—na, asmābhir varṇapadavākyānām āśutaravināśitvānabhyupagamāt, vināśitvamātrābhyupagamāt|* ***udayanādibhir*** *āśutaravināśitvam aṅgīkriyata iti cet—na,* ***asmābhir udayanādīnāṃ prāmāṇikatvānaṅgīkārāt****, sūtre cāśutaravināśitvāpratipa-*

It would of course be of particular interest to compare Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in some detail with the post-Udayana authors who he knew, especially Vallabhācārya and Vādivāgīśvara. This is something which must be postponed; let me just say that it is my impression at present that the latter may have been a significant influence on our author, although the direct references to him are, again, all critical, and indeed the two differ on many important points.

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's influence on later authors is again a subject which would require an extensive investigation. Telang has usefully collected the explicit references to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra that can be found in other writers' works (1920, 35–38); there seems to be a preponderance of Southern writers among these. While the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* clearly was a work that was well-studied, the same does not appear to have been the case for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentatorial writings. The manuscripts of his VS commentary (both versions), it may be recalled, are all Malayalam ones, whereas the manuscripts of the two parts of the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* appear to be both Devanāgarī ones, and are preserved in Northern libraries. Direct references to either commentary by later writers do not seem to have been uncovered as yet. As far as I can see, the original ideas Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra sets forth in the VS commentary have been neither adopted by others—even in the work of his pupil Bhaṭṭa Rāghava I have not found them adhered to—nor explicitly taken up for refutation. Of course it is possible that this picture may change, and that works presently unpublished or unavailable to me may turn out to have been influenced by or to react against Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's innovative Vaiśeṣika.

1.4.5 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style

Something should perhaps be said under this heading too; after all even in technical, śāstric, literature the way a writer chooses to express himself may be of importance for an understanding of the particular nature of his thought, as well as being of philological and linguistic interest. Elsewhere I have called Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style 'heavily influenced by Udayana' (Isaacson 1990, 14 footnote 10), and that statement is not without some justification.[109] Thus the way in which different possible answers to a particular question (*vikalpas*) are formulated and than treated one by one is very similar,[110] and the structure of many of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's compounds

tter iti (TS 44.33–45.3).

109 As far as I can see the only attempt to describe Udayana's style in some detail is the section on 'Characteristics of composition and style' in Chemparathy 1972, 39–44. Careful studies of the prose style of Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas are even rarer than investigations of their thought.

110 The use of *vikalpas* on a large scale is in itself a stylistic feature that goes back at least to Jayarāśi, several centuries before Udayana ('Jayarāśi certainly did not invent this form of reasoning, but

resembles those used by Udayana, especially in the *Lakṣaṇāvalī*. I should however also have said something about the differences between the two. Most striking is perhaps the relative freedom and versatility of Udayana's writing compared with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, where a rather limited set of syntactic patterns and turns of phrase is repeated over and over again, with only minimal variations for relief. I have not noticed any *laukikanyāya*s for instance, with which Udayana regularly enlivens his material, and few similes. Even in criticism of opponents Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is markedly less inventive.

To bring this preliminary rough survey of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as a philosopher to an end; it is clear that our author is a highly original thinker. He cannot however be said to be a great one, and I find it not surprising that it is chiefly for his work on the *mahāvidyā* syllogisms that he is remembered. The most radical of his new ideas, his attempt to equate *astitva* and *sattā*, is one which is more original than perceptive, and the way it is defended smacks I think more of the clever debater than the consistent and careful theorist.

1.5 The new edition and its basis

A new edition is presented below of two *adhyāya*s of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. From a perusal of it, it will I think become clear that the entire text deserves a fresh treatment. It should be noted, however, that to re-edit the first two *adhyāya*s, it would be vital to also take into consideration the evidence of the long version, which we have in almost complete form for that part of the work; or, even better perhaps, the two should be edited together.

The *adhyāya*s I have chosen to work on here present a marked contrast: *Adhyāya* 6 contains little technical Vaiśeṣika material, dealing largely with questions related to *dharma* and liberation, but is thereby perhaps all the more interesting for a somewhat wider audience. It contains many clear or hidden links with other, more familiar, lines of development in Indian thought; I have not attempted to explore these in any detail. Wezler has announced a monograph to be devoted to this *adhyāya*, in which it may be hoped that more justice will be done to its contents.[111] The

no one before him used this way of arguing with such persistence and ingenuity, and nowhere before was the full force of this reasoning brought to light' Franco 1994, 14). But I have not noticed anyone before Udayana who, having formulated the alternatives, proceeds (not always, but frequently enough) to number them individually in the following section treating and refuting them in detail, with formulations such as *na prathamaḥ*... *na dvitīyaḥ*..., or *prathame*... *dvitīye*..., and in this Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra seems to follow him with considerable enthusiasm.

111 See Wezler 1982b, 96 n. 31 and Wezler 1985, 282.

seventh *adhyāya*, on the other hand, contains a number of separate discussions of particular qualities and problems connected therewith, and is much more technical in nature.

1.5.1 The manuscript of the abridged version

As far as I have been able to determine, the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS is preserved in a single manuscript written on palm-leaves and in early Malayalam script. The existence of the manuscript was reported for the first time in 1952, in a very brief article by V. Venkatarama Sharma, who writes in a way that seems to imply that the manuscript was actually owned by him.[112] In the English introduction of the *editio princeps* of our text, Thakur describes his manuscript basis as follows.

> The commentary on the Vaiśeṣikasūtras of Kaṇāda, presented in the following pages, is based upon a transcript from a single Malayalam manuscript prepared and supplied to us by the late lamented scholar, V. A. Ramaswami Śāstrin, Professor of Sanskrit, Travancore University (Retired) and lately of the Dictionary Department, Deccan College, Poona. The manuscript was first described in the Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, Vol. I. 1952, pp. 225–7, by Mahopādhyāya Paṇḍita V. Venkatarama Sharma, Vidyābhuṣaṇa [sic], Department of Sanskrit, Travancore University. The transcript shows that the manuscript ends with the first Āhnika of the 9th Adhyāya while the Vaiśeṣikadarśana consists of ten Adhyāyas of two Āhnikas each. The name of the author or of the commentary does not appear anywhere. We have called it the Vyākhyā for the sake of convenience. The manuscript appears to be full of lacunae and occasional mistakes. Sometimes big passages seem to have been omitted through carelessness of the scribe. (p. 7)

The Sanskrit introduction (*bhūmikā*) has a roughly corresponding passage.

> *atrālambanaṃ malayalipinibaddhā tālīpatravilikhitā granthapātabahulā navamādhyāyādyāhnikāntā ekaiva mātṛkā | na mātṛkāntarodanto 'nviṣyatām asmākaṃ śrutipatham apy āgataḥ | mātṛkeyam anantaśayanaviśvavidyālayaprādhyāpakacarasya paṇḍitadhaureyasya divaṃgatasya vi° e° rāmasvāmiśāstrimahodayasyāntika āsīt | tenaivātiyatne-*

112 'Recently I was able to procure a palmleaf manuscript containing an unknown commentary (*vṛtti*) on the Vaiśeṣika-sūtras, with the text.' Sharma 1952, 226.

nāsyāḥ pratilipir devākṣaramayī sampādyāsmabhyam samarpitā।
(p. 23)

This provides some additional information, such as the fact that the manuscript is a palm-leaf one[113] and that the transcript (*pratilipi*) used by Thakur was in Devanāgarī, and is more precise in saying that the manuscript is written in Malayalam script, instead of calling it a 'Malayalam manuscript.' The wording . . . *rāmasvāmiśāstrimahodayasyāntika āsīt* suggests, more strongly than the English passage does, that Śāstrin owned the manuscript. Finally, only the Sanskrit version explicitly states that though another manuscript of the commentary was sought for, Thakur did not learn of the existence of any.

Considering the fact that this unique manuscript was evidently in private possession when Sharma's brief account of it was written and when the transcript of it was made for Thakur, we may consider it a very fortunate circumstance that it is still in existence. All too many manuscripts owned by learned pandits have been lost forever over the last decades, thrown into rivers or disposed of in some other fashion after the death of their owners.[114] For this reason I was not optimistic when I first set out to try and track down the manuscript, with only the scanty published information about it as a guide, and my delight was all the greater when it was discovered that the manuscript has now passed into the relatively safe keeping of the famous Kerala University Manuscripts Library.[115] The route by which the manuscript, which now is numbered 21600C, came into the library's collection is not completely clear. It is among the more recent acquisitions, and has not yet been catalogued. According to the library's records, its last owner was K.V. Sharma. There can however be little doubt that this is indeed the very same manuscript which was described by V. Venkatarama Sharma and transcribed for Thakur; for that the manuscript agrees too closely with the edition. For instance, the lacunae in the edition which Thakur usually attempts to fill up by conjecture nearly always correspond to the places where text has been lost due to the margins of the palm-leaf manuscript being broken.

113 As had been mentioned by Sharma (1952, 226).

114 In this the breakdown of family tradition, as children of traditional scholars turn to other professions as an economic necessity, has doubtless played an important role.

115 I call this 'relatively safe keeping' because, though the risk of a manuscript in this collection being deliberately disposed of is no doubt very small, the circumstances in which the manuscripts are kept were, when I visited the library in 1991, somewhat alarming. In another important *codex unicus*, the manuscript of Bhāruci's commentary on the *Manusmṛti*, I myself saw worms at work, further destroying the already damaged codex, when it was taken out and unwrapped for me. Of course it is largely the inadequate financial resources of this and other manuscript libraries that is to blame for the fact that so little is done towards conserving such treasures.

1.5.2 Description of the manuscript

Having consulted the manuscript only from photographs, I am unable to give anything close to a codicologically thorough description here.

The condition of the manuscript seems to have deteriorated but little from the time that the transcript Thakur used was made. The margins of most of the leaves are damaged, frequently resulting in the loss of a few *akṣaras*, but in some cases rather more than that. Only in a few places does it appear that syllables which were in Thakur's transcript, and hence presumably legible in the palm-leaf manuscript when the transcript was made, have now been lost, as a result of further crumbling of the margins. Several folios have been considerably darkened, most probably due to the effects of smoke, but this has not led to the text becoming illegible. There are a few worm-holes, but for a manuscript of its presumed age, it seems to have suffered relatively little from such vermin; occasionally an *akṣara* or two is lost or damaged.

There are nine lines of writing on each side, the top or bottom one being often rather shorter than the rest, due to the not perfectly regular shape of the long palm-leaves. The leaves have two symmetrically placed string-holes, which do not show too many signs of wear. Around the left one a roughly rectangular space is left open, lines 3–7 of the writing having been interrupted for this purpose.

In addition to the commentary we are concerned with, it contains the *Nyāyadīpāvalī* and a commentary thereon; this precedes our text, which covers folios 110–147. At the end, some stray folios occur containing part of the end of Śaktibhadra's well-known play, the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*; these probably originally belonged to a different manuscript. At no place is there any information about the time or place in which the manuscript was copied.

1.5.3 The script and the scribe

The hand is early Malayalam; though the script is a most uncertain basis for dating, I would hazard that it may have been written in the seventeenth century.[116] It should be remembered though that there still is no thorough study available of Malayalam manuscript-palaeography.[117] A single feature to which attention may be drawn is

116 In this guess I find myself in agreement with Sharma's estimate of the age of the manuscript as some three hundred years (cf. Sharma 1951, 226).

117 Burnell's classic work on South-Indian palaeography, which still has not been superseded, particularly with regard to manuscript palaeography, treats Malayalam (which he refers to as Western Grantha) in a rather inadequate fashion, in my opinion; one has the impression that Burnell did not really work much with, or enjoy working with, Malayalam manuscripts. Note for instance his remark 'MSS. from Malabar proper are generally written in a very irregular sprawling

that medial *au* consists merely of a stroke after the consonant sign, and does not also have one before it; I have been unable to find mention of this in the literature available to me.

Aside from having a hand which is aesthetically pleasing, the scribe seems in no way a remarkable one. The only punctuation marks used are occasional small dots (as is customary in manuscripts in Malayalam script), and these actually form a useful feature of the manuscript, for in the large majority of cases they are placed before or after a sūtra, so that it seems clear that their main function was to destinguish the *mūla* text from the commentary. In the cases where they are not so placed, it is often plausible that the scribe mistook a sentence in the commentary for a sūtra.

The folios are numbered in the left margins of the recto sides with letter-numerals according to the *naṇṇādi* system. Only on a few leaves has the numbering been preserved complete, however, due to crumbling of the margins; often it is lost altogether. In colophons the scribe regularly uses a sign which should probably be regarded as a developed, stylized, form of *śrī* (cf. Burnell 1878, 82).

1.5.3.1 Scribal errors and corrections

The manuscript has more than a few obvious scribal errors, and these are rather unevenly distributed, a fact which may perhaps be due to lapses of concentration or tiredness. In addition, there are of course many places where one suspects an error, but without being absolutely certain of it or of its precise nature.

I have tried to discuss important and doubtful cases in the notes to the translation. Among the errors,[118] individual and recurrent, that one might draw attention to here, a number fall into well-known categories.[119]

hand' (1878, 42); also his criticism of 'the substitution of l and ḷ for a final t or ṭ, when these letters *unchanged* precede other consonants, or are final' in the words 'This practice is totally wrong according to all authorities, and probably arises out of the tendency of the people of Malabar to slur over all surd consonants' is in my opinion not really justified.

118 The mistakes discussed all fall into the category of 'mechanical variant.' As far as I can see, there is no *evidence* for 'determined variants,' i.e. deliberate alterations by the scribe of the text he was copying from, in either of the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts discussed here (for the distinction between 'mechanical variants' and 'determined variants' see Greetham 1992, 279–283). This does not mean of course that one can be sure that there are no variants of this type.

119 While the usage of European medieval scribes has been studied intensively and the types of errors which they are prone to commit analysed, similar studies for Sanskrit (and other Indic) manuscripts are rare and, in view especially of the immense quantity and variety of material, inadequate. Of course many classes of mistakes are common to European and Indian scribes, being simply such as any human will inevitably sometimes fall into when copying a text, *bhrānteḥ puruṣadharmatvāt*. But there are significant differences none the less: in general the Indian situation is much more complex, with large variation in scribal usage according to region and pe-

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). These are difficult to identify with certainty when there is no other manuscript available, but at a few places I have felt confident enough to assume an occurrence and have proposed a correction; cf. e.g. the commentary on 7.2.18 and footnote 41 on p. 130 below.

2. Haplography. A case in which we may conclude with some degree of certainty that this has played a role is the *kṛte kimarthaḥ* transmitted in the *avataraṇa* to 7.1.1, surely an error for *kṛteti kimarthaḥ* (cf. footnote 8 on p. 101 below). It is to be remembered that Malayalam *t* and *k* are very similar.

3. Dittography. This seems to be occasionally involved, for instance in *ata āta āha* for *ata āha* in the *avataraṇa* to 6.2.14.

4. Misreading of similar *akṣara*s. The cases which can be identified all point to the manuscript having been copied from an exemplar that was also written in Malayalam or a similar Southern script. For instance, there are several cases of confusion of *p* and *v*, such as °*tavanaparispanda*° for °*tapanaparispanda*° in the commentary on 7.2.27.

One might also note the fairly frequent loss of superscript *r* and subscript *y*.

Many errors cannot be explained in one of these ways, and seem rather to involve wrong anticipation of the scribe; i.e. substitution of an expected word even if this bears no palaeographic similarity with what I assume was the original reading; cf. e.g. footnote 40 on p. 112 below. Of course one cannot be sure at what point in the transmission such mistakes arose.

Corrections are rather few; there are no marginal or inter-linear additions. Occasionally *akṣara*s have been cancelled by beeing struck through or being placed in brackets. I see no signs of a hand other than that of the original scribe having been involved.

1.5.4 Editorial policy

Even with the palm-leaf original at our disposal, to establish a satisfactory text of the commentary is a formidable task—in several cases an impossible one. The manuscript contains a rather large number of scribal errors, and numerous passages are

riod, and with many more varieties of script to be dealt with. The publication of facsimiles and diplomatic transcriptions of Indic manuscripts should be encouraged to facilitate further study of these and other codicological and palaeographical questions.

viciously corrupt. Larger lacunae can of course hardly be restored with anything approaching certainty, unless another manuscript should come to light. The character and style of the text also does not make matters any simpler. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style is often intricate,[120] his thought, influenced by Udayana, sophisticated and his explanations of sūtras frequently surprising, not to say unnatural. Still, collation of the manuscript revealed that it is possible to improve significantly, in some cases dramatically, on Thakur's edition, by correcting numerous errors which arose, most probably, in the transcript, including several cases where the transcriber inadvertantly omitted text owing to eyeskip. In the case of lacunae, access to the manuscript makes it possible to extract as much information as possible from any surviving fragments of *akṣaras* and the size of the portion which has been destroyed or is illegible.

Methodologically, the editing of this work poses problems of a very particular kind. These are caused first of all by the fact that it is preserved in a *codex unicus*, and secondly by the somewhat curious circumstance that it is most probably an abridgement of a work by one author which was prepared by another.[121] A comparison of the portions which are available in both the long and the abridged version of the commentary immediately shows that it is worse than futile to imagine that the former could ever be restored on the basis of the latter. The most that one can aim for is clearly to correct the text of our sole manuscript in the hope of restoring the form in which it was first written out or dictated by the unknown abridger. But we must allow for the fact that the abridgement was in some cases unsuccesful and therefore that the 'original' which we aim at recovering may well be a flawed one—much more so than in cases where we have only the intentions of a sole author to discover. Inconsistencies, for example, may sometimes have arisen due to a misunderstanding or a slip on the part of the abridger. It is even possible that the abridger made deliberate changes of substance which affect the interpretation given of the sūtras. And of course it is especially to be reckoned with that when omitting sections, large or small, insufficient care on the part of the abridger may have caused an important part of an argument or chain of thought to have been lost, or that the transitions between sentences or segments of text may have become abrupt or awkward.

In dealing with our sole source, we must therefore be aware of the possibility of over-correcting. For this reason a conservative policy is to be preferred, and I have been cautious and sparing in attempts to improve the transmitted text. Even so, cases where the manuscript reading could not be allowed to stand are many, as are those where a lacuna caused by damage to the manuscript must be filled as best we

120 Though at least the abridged version makes for easier reading than the long one.
121 See the discussion on p. 21ff. above.

can. Opinions will differ on what is tolerable in such a text, and while some may feel readings I have accepted unchanged to be in need of correction, others may perhaps wish to un-do some of my emendations. From the translation and annotation the tentative nature of the established text and the extent to which unsolved problems remain will become plain. Of these problems many may yet, as I hope, be resolved by the ingenuity of others, if not by the discovery of fresh, independent manuscript material.

In emending and restoring the text of the commentary our most valuable resource and safest guide is the corpus of our author's other writings, including of course the surviving part of the full version of the commentary on the VS. These works, which show clear unity of style and thought, allow us to correct and sometimes identify corruptions in our text, both through parallels they provide as to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's language and phrasing and, on occasion, through parallel discussions of a topic dealt with in our work. For the latter, it is the *Tarkasāgara* and the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* which, as might be expected, are of frequent help; whereas the *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* is of use chiefly as an instance of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style of writing and of philosophy. Of course it is a fact to be regretted, and one which may to some unforeseeable extent obscure and mislead in the matter of such parallels, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's other works are themselves only available in editions which are less than fully satisfactory. But this is an old story, and something which in the present state of Sanskrit studies may nearly always be automatically assumed—short of re-editing all these works simultaneously, there is little that can be done save to make cautious use of the printed texts and remain alert to the possibility of corruption.

In the case of conjectural restorations of text lost due to damage to the manuscript, I have had the advantage of being able to estimate with some acccuracy how many syllables have been lost. From his restorations of the same passages I suspect that Thakur's transcript gave no indications in this regard, for often a conjecture of Thakur must be considered implausible for the simple reason that there would not have been nearly enough space in the manuscript for it. Most probably the transcriber simply indicated all lacunae with a few dots, without troubling to estimate the number of lost *akṣara*s. Of course one cannot be sure that such an estimate is always a trustworthy guide, as it is possible that at just such a place where the manuscript has been damaged the scribe had omitted text, for instance due to eyeskip.

The most strict imperative for the editor is clearly to report the readings of the sole witness as faithfully as possible in all matters of substance. In this regard Thakur's edition is clearly most unsatisfactory; first of all because it is based only on a transcript of the MS, and secondly because even the readings of this transcript are not reported with any degree of care. In the eighty-one pages of text in the *editio prin-*

ceps there is not a single footnote that gives a reading of the transcript. One convention only is used to indicate editorial changes, the placing of square brackets around portions of the text, and exactly what this signifies in each instance is not made clear. The remark in Thakur's English introduction, '[t]he frequent use of brackets both in the sūtras as well as in the commentary will show that we had to take liberty in many cases wherever the manuscript was found defective' (p. 9), shows that they are indicative of editorial intervention, but no distinction is apparently made between corruption, lacunae indicated in the transcript and lacunae not indicated but conjectured. The Sanskrit introduction also mentions these two uses of these brackets, *sūtreṣu vyākhyāyāṃ ca khaṇḍitayojanam apekṣitapūraṇaṃ vā bandhanyā sūcitam* (p. 23). On one sole occasion is the meaning of the brackets made explicit: on p. 16, where two sūtras (numbered 1.2.12–13) are placed in their entirety within brackets there is a note which tells us that *bandhanīsthitaṃ sūtradvayaṃ mātṛkāyām anullikhitam api vyākhyayā apekṣitam*; this is thus a case where we are clearly informed that the transcript indicated no lacuna but one was suspected by Thakur. Elsewhere, however, the brackets are placed around syllables or words which are lost due to damage in the manuscript, and of which we may undoubtably suppose that their loss was indicated in Thakur's transcript; in other cases yet, they seem to indicate syllables which have been altered by the editor, while to judge from the evidence of the manuscript, a great part of the editorial emendations is not indicated at all. Of course, without access to the transcript, it is never quite certain whether a divergence between the manuscript and the text of Thakur's edition originates from the transcriber or from Thakur.

1.5.5 The *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

While apart from Thakur's pioneering editions little work has been done on the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, the *sūtrapāṭha* followed therein has attracted some attention. In its own right, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is of course of interest and importance, but in view of the difficulties surrounding the VS, it is perhaps natural that many scholars should find the importance of the work to lie more in its testimony to the sūtra-text than in the commentary itself, which so clearly breathes the spirit of a later period.

On the problem of determining the text of the sūtras as known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, Thakur makes the following remarks.

> The commentary gives the sūtra-text also. But the manuscript does not distinguish the sūtras from the commentary. The commentary in its turn, generally does not give any introduction to, or a word

> for word explanation of, the sūtras. Hence it was sometimes found very difficult to ascertain the sūtrapāṭha followed. The lacunae were also formidable hurdles. It is at times felt that some sūtras have been covered by them in the manuscript. Moreover, some sūtras have only been referred to while many others are found untouched. The Sūtrapāṭha in the present edition *should not be regarded as the exact version followed by our commentator* [my emphasis]. Thus we have not changed abhāvas tamaḥ into bhā 'bhāvas tamaḥ in V. ii. 19 *though the commentary suggests it* [my emphasis]. The frequent use of brackets both in the sūtras as well as in the commentary will show that we had to take liberty in many cases wherever the manuscript was found defective. Sometimes we thought ourselves fortunate as the word or words lost in the sūtra-text were suggested by the commentary. In others, we had to follow Śaṅkara Miśra for want of a better authority. But no sūtra has been accepted here the existence of which was not somehow suggested either by the commentary or by direct mention in the manuscript.[122] (p. 9)

These remarks give a good indication of the difficulty of reconstructing the *sūtrapāṭha*, but are less than perfectly clear as to Thakur's precise policy (cf. especially the emphasized portions of the quotation). The confession that in some cases Śaṃkara Miśra's reading has been followed 'for want of a better authority' leads one to expect that with the help of Candrānanda's *sūtrapāṭha* (and commentary), which was published in 1961, four years after the appearance of Thakur's edition,[123] some improvement would prove possible. Indeed, a big step in this direction was made by Jambūvijaya in the second appendix of his invaluable edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, which gives a comparative table of the sūtras as found in the two commentaries. Jambūvijaya was not content to print Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha* in the form given by Thakur, but in a praiseworthy fashion reconsidered the entire text in the light of the commentary and, especially, the new evidence provided by Candrānanda. In the introductory section of this

122 There is no corresponding passage in Thakur's Sanskrit introduction.

123 Thakur was aware of the fact that Jambūvijaya was preparing an edition of Candrānanda's commentary, for on p. 20 of his English introduction he writes that '[w]e are glad to note that under the auspices of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, Jaina Muni Śrī Jambūvijayaji has undertaken an edition of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras along with the hitherto unpublished commentary of Candrānanda. We hope that this commentary will throw much welcome light on the problems of the Vaiśeṣika system.' Later Thakur contributed an English introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. At the time of his own work on the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, however, he clearly did not have access to Candrānanda's commentary, either in the form of manuscripts or proofs of Jambūvijaya's edition.

appendix, after explaining the difficulty of determining the form of the VS known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, Jambūvijaya writes that, although he has followed Thakur in most places, there were also cases where they do not agree, and that the *sūtrapāṭha* and numbering given are his own reconstruction.[124]

Unlike Thakur, it seems therefore that Jambūvijaya has adopted the support of the commentary as his most important criterium in establishing the text of the sūtras: a procedure which appears to me wholly justified. He identified many sūtras which Thakur had mistaken for sentences of the commentary and made corrections to numerous others. His contribution is an important one, and only in a few places do I find it difficult to follow the reasoning behind his proposals.[125]

The next scholar who concerned himself with the problem of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭhaḥ*, M. Nozawa, describes the situation and his own position as follows.

> The sūtras of *V*. are not distinguished from the commentary in the manuscript. In the text, they are separated from the commentary and printed in large type. The editor says that the sūtrapāṭha in the edition should not be regarded as the exact version followed by the commentator, because he had to follow *U*. [i.e. the sūtra text attested to by Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary, the *Vaiśeṣikasūtropaskāra*] for want of a better authority (Intr. p. 9). (*C*. [i.e. Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary] had not been published then.) Four years later C., edited by Muni Srī Jambuvijayaji [sic], was published. The Dvitīyaṃ Pariçiṣṭam of this book (pp. 101ff.) gives the comparative table of the sūtras between *C*. and *V*. In its foreword the

124 To quote Jambūvijaya's remarks in full: *kiñ ca, mātṛkāyāṃ sūtrapāṭhaḥ pṛthag naivāsti, vṛttir eva vidyate, tatra ca bahutaraḥ sūtrapāṭhaḥ mātṛkāyāṃ vṛttyā miśrita eva vartate, ataḥ sampādakena yaḥ sūtrapāṭhaḥ sambhāvitaḥ prāyaḥ sa eva bahuṣu sthaleṣv atrāsmābhir upadarśitaḥ, kin tu santi kānicit sthalāni yatra sūtrapāṭhanirṇaye 'smākaṃ vimatiḥ* (here Jambūvijaya adds a footnote in which he quotes the same passage from Thakur's introduction to his edition on the difficulty of determining the *sūtrapāṭhaḥ* which was quoted on p. 48 above) | *yato mi.vṛttau yady api bahutaraḥ sūtrapāṭho miśrito vartate tathāpi katicit sūtrāṇi mātṛkāyāṃ parigalitāni, katipayāni mi.vṛttāv avyākhyātāni, keṣāñcit ca sūtrāṇāṃ mi.vṛttau kevalā vyākhyaiva vidyate, kānicic ca sūtrāṇi vyākhyāsaukaryārthaṃ kvacit kvacid itas tataḥ śabdakramaparivartanaṃ vidhāya kāṃścic ca śabdān pūrayitvā mi. vṛttāv upanyastāni | tasmāt sampūrṇaḥ sūtrapāṭho mi. vṛttyanusāreṇa yathāvan nirṇetuṃ na śakyate | atas tādṛśeṣu sthaleṣu* ***mi.*** *pustake 'mudrito 'pi* ***sūtrapāṭho yathāsmābhiḥ sambhāvitas*** ***tathaivātra*** *mi.vṛttikṛdabhimatatayā sambhāvite sūtrapāṭhe 'smābhir upanyastaḥ sūtrāṅkāś ca parivartitā iti dhyeyam* | (p. 101; Jambūvijaya's emphasis). The designation *mi. vṛtti*, i.e. 'Mithilā commentary,' by which Jambūvijaya refers to our text does not intend to imply that the commentary was a product of the Mithilā school of Nyāya(-Vaiśeṣika), but merely alludes to the fact that Thakur's edition was published in that province, and as a volume of the *Mithilāvidyāpīṭhagranthamālā*.

125 For instance with regard to 7.1.4 (not recognized as a sūtra by Thakur): see the annotation to the translation below.

> editor says that some sūtras of V. in this table (abr. M.) are determined according to his own supposition. And we find corrections in more than fifty sūtras. But among these some are inconsistent with the explanations of V. and others are merely assimilated with the sūtras of C.; therefore M. can not be regarded as the exact version, either. The sūtrapāṭha of V. is still under necessity of inspection.
>
> The following corrections are made in this principle that, finding passages identical with or resembling the sūtras of C. and being able to regard them as sūtras contextually, we correct the text within the limits of alternation of partition of the sentences, and do not change the words of the word order excepting those of the lacunal parts which are put in brackets in the text. (Nozawa 1974, 473(25))

Nozawa is thus commendably explicit as to the principles followed in his determination of the *sūtrapāṭha*. However his results are somewhat disappointing. In a few instances he does indeed improve on Jambūvijaya's text, but in many others his rejection of Jambūvijaya's proposals is unjustified and has proved mistaken (cf. below). The *sūtrapāṭha* which he proposes can be found in its entirety in Nozawa 1985: I have not noticed any divergencies in this later article from his suggestions of 1974.

By and large, then, Jambūvijaya has presented the most plausible reconstruction of the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. As was to be expected, however, access to the manuscript itself allows further progress to be made.[126] For one thing, the small dots which are the only mark of punctuation employed (see p. 44 above) clearly serve to mark sūtras, and provide aid which, had Thakur been able to make use of it, would have prevented numerous errors with regard to the identification of sūtras. At the same time it must however be remembered that the use of these dots is neither completely consistent nor without errors—if we assume that the marking off of sūtras was their sole purpose.

More importantly, there are cases where entire sūtras have been omitted in Thakur's edition due to (usually haplographical) loss of text in his transcript. As examples may serve 6.1.12, 6.2.6, 7.1.19 and 7.2.4. It may be of interest to note that with the exception of the case of 6.2.6 Jambūvijaya had already conjectured that these sūtras should be incorporated into Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*, and at the right places, whereas Nozawa conjectured a reading of 7.1.19 (7.1.13 as numbered by Thakur and Nozawa) which hardly makes sense and rejected Jambūvijaya's conjecture at 6.1.12 and 7.2.4. This speaks eloquently for Jambūvijaya's

126 For the *sūtrapāṭha* of the first two *adhyāyas*, the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary now is of course an important witness.

acute philological sense and the attention with which he read the text. Finally, there are of course several cases where Thakur's text is based on a misreading; again this was sometimes correctly recognized by Jambūvijaya, as at 7.2.10, where Jambūvijaya's conjecture, confirmed by the manuscript despite damage, was again rejected by Nozawa.

In dealing with the text of the sūtras, a slightly different approach from that followed with respect to the commentary may be legitimate. Here I believe there is less reason to be wary of the possibility of over-correction. In cases, for instance, where a sūtra is omitted entirely in the manuscript, the decision to include it conjecturally in the text in some form has not been influenced by the possibility that the abridger had already omitted it from his text,[127] but is made on the basis of the degree of likelihood that it formed part of the *sūtrapāṭha* as known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. Besides, for the reading of the sūtras we have additional material in the form of no less than four other recensions of the complete text,[128] an incomplete recension of *adhyāya*s 9 and 10[129] and numerous quotations and parallels. I see no reason why this material should not be taken into account, though it cannot of course be binding; thus in a case where the manuscript diverges against the unanimous testimony of our other sources and the commentary does not allow to determine the precise form which it presupposes, an emendation of the transmitted text should at least be seriously considered.

1.5.6 Conventions of the text and apparatus

As remarked above, in view of the scanty material on which this edition is based, in all cases where it has been found necessary to depart from the text of the manuscript, accurate presentation of its readings is of great importance. For this reason I have chosen to print the text in Roman transliteration, which frequently allows greater precision when reporting doubtful and damaged readings, and has the added advantage that most word-divisions are made explicit. I have not chosen to use a convention to indicate that two words have coalesced in *svarasandhi*, but I trust that with the aid of the translation doubtful cases, should there be any, will be clear. Punctuation, consisting of commas, long dashes and *daṇḍa*s, has been added and

127 Such an omission on the part of the abridger, if it indeed occurred, would I presume be due to oversight rather than a deliberate desire to abridge the sūtras as well as the commentary.

128 Namely the version commented on by Candrānanda, the version commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra, the recension represented by the Ahmedabad manuscript and the recension represented by the Trivandrum manuscript. For some remarks on the first of these, together with a partial re-edition, see Part 2 of this thesis; the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts are treated in Part 3.

129 Cf. the second appendix of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*, Thakur 1965 and p. 12 above.

is always editorial. The dots which serve for punctuation marks in the manuscript have been reproduced; they have, as we remarked above, some value as a help in identifying sūtras, and to report them in the apparatus instead would have caused a not inconsiderable increase in size. It is hoped that they will not prove disturbing. The application of sandhi has been normalized, i.e. rules of external sandhi have been consistently applied except when a punctuation mark separates two words. The sūtras have been set apart and indented, and numbers have been added.[130]

Various kinds of brackets have been used in the text and apparatus, chiefly to indicate editorial interventions.

( ) Indicate that a reading is probable but uncertain; this has reference to the condition of the manuscript and the clarity of the *akṣara*s, not to the wording of the text.

⟨ ⟩ Enclose syllables (or parts of syllables) which have been supplied to fill up lacunae due to damage of the manuscript.

⟦ ⟧ Enclose syllables or parts of syllables which have been added where the manuscript is not damaged, i.e. where I assume that they have been omitted due to (scribal) error.

[ ] Enclose editorial additions which do not form a part of the text—folio indications and references to other sūtras.

No attempt has been made to mark passages whereof the wording is uncertain; uncertainties abound in this text, and I hope to have pointed out and discussed all the major ones in the notes to the translation.

The apparatus aims at reporting all variants of substance in both the manuscript and the *editio princeps*. By variants of substance I mean here differences which change or obscure the sense. This excludes variants of orthography, sandhi and punctuation which a reader accustomed to the orthography and habits of scribes would not interpret as actual differences in wording. To be more precise, the following types of variation have not been treated as variants of substance.

1. Gemination of consonants after or before a semi-vowel, most frequently *r*. Examples: *dharmaḥ* / *dharmmaḥ*, *kāryam* / *kāryyam*.[131]

130 For a concordance of the numbering in Thakur's edition, this edition and the numberings of Jambūvijaya and Nozawa, as well as other recensions of the VS, see Appendix 1.

131 Aspirates being geminated by the placing of the corresponding non-aspirate before them (cf. Wackernagel I §96), orthographies such as *rtth* for *rth* and *rddhv* for *rdhv*, which we usually find in the manuscript, also fall under this heading.

2. Reduction of a double consonant to a single one before a semi-vowel. Example: *tattvam / tatvam*.

3. Use of *anusvāra* for homorganic nasal or vice-versa. Examples: *aṅgaḥ / aṃgaḥ*, *kiṃ tu / kin tu*. It may be remarked that in the manuscript *ṃ* and the *halanta* form of *m* are not always clearly distinguishable.

4. Use of class-sibilant for *visarga* before a sibilant. Example: *prathamaḥ śabdaḥ / prathamaś śabdaḥ*.

5. Non-application of sandhi.

The apparatus is a positive one; this means that each entry begins with a lemma which repeats the relevant portion of text exactly as it was given in the body of the edition, followed by a : to mark the end of the lemma. After this the source of the reading is given, followed by a comma and then the actual variants. The following sigla and abbreviations are used.

MS The reading found in the manuscript.

MS^{pc} The reading of the manuscript after (scribal) correction (*post correctionem*).

MS^{ac} The reading of the manuscript before (scribal) correction (*ante correctionem*).

em. An emendation. If the emendation is already found in Thakur's edition, I add '*with* Thakur,' and if he has no indication that it is an emendation (i.e. if there are no brackets in his text) I further add '(*silently*).'

conj. A conjecture. If the conjecture is already found in Thakur's edition, I add '*with* Thakur,' and if he has no indication that it is a conjecture (i.e. if there are no brackets in his text) I further add '(*silently*).'

The difference between an 'emendation' and a 'conjecture' is a frankly subjective one. Use of the former term indicates a greater confidence in the correctness of the change proposed. Despite this subjective nature, it seemed useful to introduce such a distinction; there is after all a considerable difference between e.g. changing *niṣkrayaḥ śabdaḥ* to *niṣkriyaḥ śabdaḥ* and conjecturally filling up a lacuna of eight or nine *akṣaras*.

In cases where we have a lacuna in the manuscript, usually caused by crumbling of the margins, I add an estimate of the number of *akṣaras* which might have been written. It is to be remembered in considering these places, some of which

may be called cruxes, that these approximations are very rough, and become more unreliable in proportion to the size of the lacuna. The amount of space taken up by an *akṣara* varies considerably, especially since *akṣara*s with *pṛṣṭhamātra e, ai* or *o* require considerably more space.

1.5.7 The translation and notes

With a work such as this, not infrequently difficult to follow, and beset with textual problems, it seemed imperative to add to the edition a translation and annotation. Both have limited aims, but taken together it is hoped that they form a moderately detailed, though not exhaustive, commentary on the text of the edition. The translation is intended as a check on the edition, making clear how I have interpreted the text I have restored, and is not one which can easily be read on its own, without reference to the Sanskrit. It is not completely literal—no translation is—but sufficiently so that it should be plain how I construe the Sanskrit.

The translation of the sūtras is in accordance with the interpretations given by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as far as these can be determined. Words which the commentary suggest should be supplied are added within square brackets, except in some cases where the need for this is removed by the commentary itself explicitly stating that certain words are to be added to the sūtra.

Since I expect that no-one will read the translation who is not able to turn to the Sanskrit, I have not made any particular effort to find the happiest translations for various technical terms and śāstric turns of phrase, but have most frequently stuck with equivalents which are in fairly common use. For the same reason, some Sanskrit words have been left untranslated. Whether it is possible and desirable to translate a text of this nature in such a way that philosophers with no Sanskrit can read and comprehend it is in any case, in my view, a doubtful question. Even if it is, I fear that I am not competent for such a task.

The annotation to the translation deals mainly with two types of difficulty: textual and exegetical.[132] I have tried to explain and justify important and difficult decisions taken in the editorial process and to draw attention to alternative possibilities and unsolved problems. All cases where I have differed in matters of substance from Thakur have been discussed. The notes on interpretation contain chiefly comparative material and discussion pertaining to historical and philosophical questions; it is to be feared that these will be found even less complete than the former type of annotation. In general, I have striven to give such commentary as is most likely to be needed, rather than attempting to be exhaustive, and the number

132 The boundary between these two areas is of course often vague.

of parallel passages given has been deliberately kept down. Nonetheless, like most commentators, I have sometimes not been able to resist the temptation to digress. In some cases a remark has been made as to the relative merits of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's and Candrānanda's reading of a sūtra or their interpretation, and Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary has also been referred to now and then, but no attempt has been made to be thorough in this regard. Such matters belong to an investigation into the original form and meaning of the VS and the historical development thereof rather than to a study such as this, which aims primarily at making available the material on which such 'higher' studies can be based.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Though the need for a new edition of this text will be plain to anyone who has worked with Thakur's edition, such an undertaking would have been utterly futile without access to the *codex unicus*. My work would therefore never have been begun but for Prof. A. Wezler and Prof. K. V. Sharma, who gave initial advice and help in my attempts to locate the manuscript, and, most of all, Mr. P. L. Shahji, who finally uncovered it and made photographs available to me. In Hamburg, during the summer semester of 1994, I had the opportunity to read through a preliminary draft of my edition of some portions of the text together with Mr. C. Nenninger, Dr. K. Preisendanz and Prof. A. Wezler. For this not only I but the readers of this edition must be thankful, for had it not been for the help of these scholars the text would have resisted my attempts at understanding and correction in many more places. I cannot fail also to acknowledge that I have benefited from comments made by Prof. T. Vetter, Dr. H. T. Bakker and Mr. Jürgen Hanneded. On several earlier occasions, before the manuscript itself was available to me, Prof. Wezler gave generously of his time to read parts of the commentary in Thakur's edition with me; this too has helped me greatly in recognizing and dealing with difficulties. Last but not least, I take pleasure in acknowledging my indebtedness to Anantalal Thakur: had he not first edited the text it might have remained forgotten till this day. I have benefited much from his work, and have adopted many emendations and conjectures which stem from him. In presenting this edition I can do no better than to repeat his words: *atra truṭibāhulyam asmān sthagayati sma viṣayagauravaṃ ca prakāśanavidhau prerayati smety ubhayata ākṛṣyamāṇair asmābhiḥ prakāśanam evorarīkṛtam.*[133]

133 From p. 23 of Thakur's Sanskrit introduction.

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1

[f. $137^{v.5}$] karmaparīkṣānantaraṃ guṇaparīkṣā kariṣyate | guṇebhyo 'bhyarhitatvād adṛṣṭaparīkṣārthaṃ ṣaṣṭhādhyāyārambhaḥ[1] | tatra dharmādharmasādhaneṣu vedaḥ pramāṇam. tatprāmāṇyam[2] īśvarapraṇītatveneti tadvyutpādanārthaṃ[3] sūtram—

· buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vede[4] · || 6.1.1

vākyakṛtir vākyaracanākrama iti yāvat | buddhipūrvā puruṣabuddhijanyā | vedavākyakramaḥ puruṣabuddhijanyaḥ, vākyakramatvāt, kālidāsavākyakramavat[5] ||

asmadādibhir a. . . tāparihārārthaṃ[6] sūtram—

na cāsmadbuddhibhyo[7] liṅgam ṛṣeḥ || 6.1.2

asmadādibuddhi[8]vākyajanakatvasya bādhitatvāt tadatiriktapuruṣabuddhau vedavākyaṃ ⟨liṅgam | sa ca⟩[9] bhagavān ṛṣir īśvaraḥ ||

· brāhmaṇasaṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam· || 6.1.3

asti tāvat sargādāv utpanneṣu brāhmaṇādiṣu brāhmaṇādipadasaṃketakaraṇa⟨m | na cāsmadādīnāṃ⟩[10] [f. 138^{r}] sargādau brāhmaṇatvādijñānam, indriyasannipātamātreṇa kṣatriyādivyāvṛttabrāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt,[11] vyañjakāntarābhāvāc ca | na tāvad atra saṃsthānaviśeṣo vyañja⟨kaḥ, kṣatri⟩yādi[12]vyāvṛttasaṃsthānaviśeṣasya yogyā[13]nupalambhanirastatvāt | nāpi brāhmaṇabhūtamātāpitṛ[14]janyatvam,

1 ṣaṣṭhādhyāyārambhaḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ṣaṣṭhyāddhyāyārambhaḥ MS
2 tatprāmāṇyam: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), tatpramāṇyam MS
3 tadvyutpādanārthaṃ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), tadyutpādanārtthaṃ MS
4 vede: *conj.*, vedaḥ MS Thakur
5 kālidāsavākyakramavat: MS, kālidāsādivākyakramavat Thakur
6 asmadādibhir a . . . tāparihārārthaṃ: (*space for up to 4 akṣaras, the first of which was probably* ka, ta, *or a ligature with* k *or* t; rttha *also possible*) MS, asmadādi[bhir ākalito 'yaṃ krama ity āśaṅkā]parihārārthaṃ Thakur
7 na cāsmadbuddhibhyo: *conj.*, sa vāsmadbuddhibhyo MS, sa vā asmadbu[ddhyanyo] Thakur
8 asmadādibuddhi°: MS, asmadādibuddher Thakur
9 vedavākyaṃ ⟨liṅgam | sa ca⟩: *conj.*, vedavākyaṃ. . . (*space for up to 5 akṣaras, the first of which had medial* i) MS, vedavākya[janakatvam iti vedakartā] Thakur
10 °saṃketakaraṇa⟨m | na cāsmadādīnāṃ⟩: *conj.*, °saṃketakaraṇa. . . (*space for up to 7 akṣaras*) MS, °saṃketakaro 'smadādivilakṣaṇaḥ yasya Thakur
11 °brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt: MS, °brāhmaṇatvādyanubhavāt Thakur
12 vyañja⟨kaḥ, kṣatri⟩yādi°: *em.*, vyañja. . . yādi° (*space for up to 4 akṣaras, the first of which was probably* ka) MS, vyañja[ko brāhmaṇatvādeḥ kṣatri]yādi° Thakur
13 °viśeṣasya yogyā°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °viśeṣasyāyogyā° MS
14 °mātāpitṛ°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °mātrāpitṛ° MS

sargādyeṣu tadasambhavāt | nāpy adṛṣṭaviśeṣākṛṣṭabhūtajanyatvam, adṛṣṭānavagame tasyāpy anavagamāt | tasmād asti kaścid bhagavān asmadādyatīndriyabrāhmaṇatvādisākṣātkārabhāk[15] saṃketagrāh[[ay]]itā,[16] santi ca kecit tatprasādāsāditāsmadādyatīndriya[17]brāhmaṇatvādisākṣātkārabhājaḥ saṃketagrahītāra iti ||

siddhe vedaprāmāṇye tat[[prati]]pādya[18]dharmasādhanapratipādanārtham upakramate—

· buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ || 6.1.4

lakṣaṇayā dhātvarthe dadātiprayogaḥ | buddhir āstikyabuddhiḥ | śraddhāpūrvakaṃ dānaṃ[19] dharmasādhanam ity arthaḥ | dānaṃ kaṃcid uddiśya tyāgaḥ | na ca yāgahomayor avyāptiḥ,[20] tayor[21] api dānaviśeṣatvāt | cetanam uddiśya dravyatyāgo[22] dānam | na yāgahomayor ativyāptiḥ,[21] devatāyā acetanatvād iti jaiminiprabhṛtayaḥ | tad ayuktam, devatāyāś cetanatvāt ||

· tathā pratigrahaḥ· ||6.1.5

śraddhāpūrvakaḥ[23] pratigraho 'pi dharmasādhanam ||

tayoś ca kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām· || 6.1.6

tayor dānapratigrahayoḥ kramaḥ kāryakāraṇabhāvarahitānām api rāsabhaghaṭādīnām iva ||

· ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt· || 6.1.7

ātmāntaraguṇānām īśvaravyatiriktātmāntaraguṇānām | devadattaniṣṭhadānadharmo[24] na yajñadattaniṣṭhapratigrahadharmakāraṇam, devadattadharmatvāt, sampratipannavat | ato dānapra[f. 138v]tigrahayoḥ kāryakāraṇabhāve pramāṇābhāvavad[25] bādhakam apy astīty uktam ||

kathaṃ tarhi yajñadattaputraniṣṭhaśrāddhadharmeṇa yajñadattaniṣṭhaprītijananam | ata āha—

15 °bhāk: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °bhājas MS
16 °grāh[[ay]]itā: *em.*, °grāhītā MS, °grahītā Thakur
17 °sāditāsmadādyatīndriya°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °sāditasmadādyatīndriya° MS
18 tat[[prati]]pādya°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °tatpādya° MS
19 °pūrvakaṃ dānaṃ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °pūrvakandāna MS
20 avyāptiḥ: *conj.*, ativyāptiḥ MS Thakur
21 tayor· · · ativyāptiḥ: MS, *om.* Thakur(eyeskip)
22 dravyatyāgo: *em.*, ddravyatyāgo MS
23 °pūrvakaḥ: MS, °pūrvaka° Thakur
24 °dānadharmo: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °dānadharmmā MS
25 pramāṇābhāvavad: *em.*, pramāṇābhāvāvat MS, pramāṇābhāvāt Thakur

· aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato 'bhyudayaḥ· || 6.1.8

aduṣṭabrāhmaṇabhojanāt tṛptāduṣṭabrāhmaṇodīritāt pitaras[26] te sukhino bhūyāsur[27] ity āśīrvādāt sukhodayaḥ ||

· [[tad]][28] duṣṭabhojane na vidyate· || 6.1.9

tad abhyudayakāraṇaṃ duṣṭabhojane na bhavati ||

·duṣṭaṃ hiṃsāyām· || 6.1.10

pravṛttaṃ viddhīti[29] śeṣaḥ | hiṃsāyām ity upalakṣaṇaṃ suvarṇasteyādīnām | duṣṭabhojane doṣa eva, nābhyudayo jāyate ||

· tad aduṣṭe na vidyate· || 6.1.11

viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ[30] · || 6.1.12

svato 'dhikaguṇavati dānārthaṃ pravṛttiḥ kāryā ||

· tathā viruddhānāṃ tyāgaḥ· || 6.1.13

yathā dānādayas tathā viruddhānām ātatāyināṃ ca tyāgo vadho 'pi dharmasādhanam ||

· sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā· || 6.1.14

viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ· || 6.1.15

utkṛṣṭātatāyivadho na kartavya eveti ||

iti ṣaṣṭhasya prathamam āhnikam[31]

26 °brāhmaṇodīritāt pitaras: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °brāhmaṇād īritāt pataras MS
27 bhūyāsur: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). bhūyāṇur MS
28 [[tad]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). *om.* MS
29 viddhīti: *em.with* Thakur (*silently*) (viddhi iti). viddhiti MS
30 viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ: MS. *om.* Thakur
31 iti ṣaṣṭhasya prathamam āhnikam: MS (*with stylized* śrī *before and after the colophon*). iti śrīmadvaiśeṣike darśane ṣaṣṭhādhyāyasya prathamāhnikam Thakur

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 2

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya· | 6.2.1

vedena[1] bodhyata iti śeṣaḥ | dṛṣṭaprayojanānām ity atrābhāvād iti śeṣaḥ | dṛṣṭābhāva ity atra svargādyutpatter iti śeṣaḥ | prayogo[2] brāhmaṇādyuddeśena[3] tyāgaḥ | tathā[4]ca dṛṣṭānāṃ hiraṇyasamidājyacarupuroḍāśādīnāṃ brāhmaṇādyuddeśena[4] tyāgaḥ svargasādhanadharmasādhanatay(ā)[5] ⟨vede⟩na[6] bodhyata iti ||

· abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasth⟦y⟧a[7]yajñadānaprokṣaṇa[8]diṅnakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || 6.2.2

⟨niyama iti pra⟩[f. 139r]tyekam[9] abhisambadhyate | abhiṣecananiyamaḥ, upavāsaniyamaḥ, brahmacaryaniyama[10] ityādi | prātar eva snātavyam ity abhiṣecananiya⟨maḥ, ekādaśyām u⟩poṣitavyam ity[11] upavāsaniyama ityādi | gurur īśvaraḥ sarveṣāṃ dharmopadeṣṭā | vanād vanaṃ pratiṣṭhata iti vānaprasthaḥ | na[12] tu tṛtīyāśramī | tasya karma vānaprasthyam[13] ||

· cāturāśramya⟨m || 6.2.3

adṛṣṭā⟩yety[14] anuvartate ||

· upadhānupadhāś ca[15] · || 6.2.4 ||

adṛṣṭāyety anuṣaṅgaḥ | upadhādharmasādhanam, anupadhā dharmasādhanam |

· bhāvadoṣa upadhā· || 6.2.5

1 vedena: MS^{pc} Thakur, vedana MS^{ac}
2 prayogo: MS, [evaṃ sati] go° Thakur
3 brāhmaṇādyuddeśena: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), brāhmaṇādyundeśana MS
4 tathā... brāhmaṇādyuddeśena: MS, *om.* Thakur(eyeskip)
5 °dharmasādhanatay(ā): MS, °dharmasādhanaṃ Thakur
6 ⟨vede⟩na: *em.*, ...na (*space for 2 akṣaras*) MS, [vedapramāṇe]na Thakur
7 °prasth⟦y⟧a°: *em.*, °prastha° MS Thakur
8 °prokṣaṇa°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °prokṣaṇan MS
9 ⟨niyama iti pra⟩tyekam: *em. with* Thakur ([niyama iti] pratyekam), ...tyekam *space for up to 6 akṣaras, the first of which had medial* i) MS
10 brahmacaryaniyama: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), brahmacaryanayami MS
11 °niya⟨maḥ | ekādaśyām u⟩poṣitavyam ity: *conj. with* Thakur (°niyamaḥ | [ekādaśyām u]poṣitavyam ity), °niya... poṣitavyam ety (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS
12 na: MS, sa Thakur
13 vānaprasthyam: *em.*, vānaspatyaṃ MS, vānaprastham Thakur
14 cāturāśramya⟨m || adṛṣṭā⟩yety: *em.*, *with* Thakur, cāturāśramya... yety (*space for up to 3 akṣaras, the last of which had medial* ā *or* o) MS
15 upadhānupadhāś ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), upadhānupadhāyāś ca MS

bhāvo 'bhisaṃdhiḥ[16] | tena duṣṭo 'bhisaṃdhir upadheti lakṣaṇam ||

· adoṣo[17] 'nupadhā· || 6.2.6

aduṣṭo 'bhisaṃdhi[[r a]]nupadheti[18] lakṣaṇam ||

· iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ[19] prokṣitam abhyukṣitaṃ ca[20] tac chuci· || 6.2.7

iṣṭā rūparasagandhasparśā yatra [[ta]]d iṣṭarūpa[[rasagandhasparśa]]m[21] | prokṣitaṃ samantrodakasiktam | abhyukṣitaṃ ca | tad iti buddhisthānnādeḥ parāmarśaḥ | tādṛśam annādi dharmasādhanam[22] ity arthaḥ ||

aśuci[23] śucipratiṣedhaḥ || 6.2.8

arthāntaraṃ ca || 6.2.9

caṇḍālādispṛṣṭam[24] aśucīti dvitīyasūtrārthaḥ ||

· ayatasya[25] śucibhojanād abhyudayo[26] na vidyate || 6.2.10

ayato[27] yamarahitaḥ ||

asati cābhāvāt[28] · || 6.2.11

asati śucibhojane yamād viśiṣṭadharmānudayād ubhayor viśiṣṭadharme kāraṇatvam ||

· sukhād rāgaḥ· || 6.2.12

anubhūyamānaṃ sukhaṃ tajjātīyasukhāntare rāgaṃ janayati | so 'pi tatsādhane, yo yat kāmaya[[te]][29] sa tatsādhanam api kāmayata iti sthiteḥ ||

16 'bhisaṃdhiḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), pi sandhiḥ MS
17 adoṣo. . . lakṣaṇam (*in commentary on 6.2.6*): MS, *om.* Thakur
18 'bhisaṃdhir anupadheti: *em.*, bhisandhinupadheti MS
19 iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ: MS, [yad] iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ Thakur
20 abhyukṣitaṃ ca: MS^{pc} (°ñ ca) Thakur, abhyukṣitiñ ca MS^{ac}
21 [[ta]]d iṣṭarūpa[[rasagandhasparśa]]m: *em. with* Thakur, draṣṭarūpaṃ MS
22 annādi dharmasādhanam: *conj.*, annābhi(dha)rmasādhanam MS, annam api dharmasādhanam Thakur
23 aśuci MS, aśuci [iti] Thakur
24 caṇḍālādispṛṣṭam: MS, cāṇḍālādispṛṣṭam Thakur
25 ayatasya: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ayātasya MS
26 abhyudayo: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), abhyudayā MS
27 ayato: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ayāto MS
28 cābhāvāt: MS^{pc} Thakur, ⟨bha⟩cābhāvāt MS
29 kāmaya[[te]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), kāmaya MS

· na tṛpteḥ· || 6.2.13

pratibandhakatvād iti śeṣaḥ | bhojanasukhānubhavo na punarbhojane pravṛttiṃ janayati, pratibandhābhāvaviśiṣṭasya tasya pravṛttijanakatvāt | sukhānubhavasya rāgakāraṇa[f. 139v]tve jātamātrasya stanapānādau rāgo na syāt, tasya sukhānubhavābhāvāt ||

ata āha[30]—

· adṛṣṭāc ca || 6.2.14

jātamātrasya jantoḥ pūrvajanmānubhūtasukhasmaraṇaṃ saṃskārādṛṣṭābhyāṃ jātaṃ[31] rāgakāraṇam ||

etena dveṣo vyākhyātaḥ· || 6.2.15

nigadavyākhyātam etat ||

yady adṛṣṭād rāgadveṣau katham tarhi manuṣyasyānnādau rāgaḥ, aśvādeś ca tṛṇādāv iti rāgaviśeṣaḥ[32] | ata āha—

· jātiviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ || 6.2.16

cakārāj jātiviśeṣād dveṣaviśeṣaḥ | anvayavyatirekābhyāṃ jātiviśeṣa(s)yāpi taddhetutvāvadhāraṇāt ||

[[icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ]][33] || 6.2.17

tataḥ saṃyogaḥ || 6.2.18

rāgadveṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām[34] apūrvaśarīrādibandhaḥ ||

· vibhāgaś ca· || 6.2.19

dharmādharmakṣayād iti śeṣaḥ ||

yadi rāgādibhyo dharmādharmau tarhi tadutpādanānuparamān na kadācin mokṣa[[ḥ]][35] syāt | ata āha—

· ātmakarmasu[36] mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ· || 6.2.20

30 āha: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), āta āha MS
31 jātaṃ: *em.*, jāta° MS Thakur
32 tṛṇādāv iti rāgaviśeṣaḥ: *em.*, tṛṇādāv iti yāgaviśeṣo (*sandhi before the following* a) MS, tṛṇādau rāgaviśeṣaḥ Thakur
33 [[icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ]]: *em.*, *om.* MS Thakur
34 rāgadveṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām: *conj.*, rāgaviśeṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām MS Thakur
35 mokṣa[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), mokṣa MS
36 ātmakarmasu: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), atmakarmasu MS

ātmā prāṇaḥ | tatkarmasu nirūpyamāṇeṣu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ, tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣa iti [*cf.* 5.2.18] sūtreṇa | sakalātmaviśeṣaguṇocchedaś ca mokṣa⟨ḥ | sukhā⟩bhāvād[37] apumarthatvam apīti samavyayaphalatvam[38] iti cet—na, sukhāpekṣayā duḥkhasya prācuryeṇa tadabhāvāt pumarthatvopapatteḥ ||

iti ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ[39]

37 mokṣa⟨ḥ | sukhā⟩bhāvād: *conj.*, mokṣa. . . bhāvād (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS, mokṣaḥ tatreṣṭasyāpy abhāvād Thakur

38 samavyayaphalatvam: MS, sama[māya]vyayaphalatvam Thakur

39 iti ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ: MS (*with stylized* śrī *before and probably after, though the latter damaged*), iti śrīmadvaiśeṣikadarśane ṣaṣṭhādhyāyasya dvitīyāhnikam ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaś ca Thakur

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1

[f. $139^{v.8}$] ⟨trivi⟩dhā[1] śāstrasya pravṛttiḥ—uddeśo lakṣaṇaṃ parīkṣā ceti caturvidhā vā—uddeśo vibhāgo lakṣaṇaṃ parīkṣā ceti | tatra guṇānām[2] uddeśavibhāgau rū⟨parasagandhaspa⟩rśāḥ[3] saṃkhyā ityādisūtreṇa [*cf.* 1.1.5] prathamādhyāye kṛtau | lakṣaṇam api dravyāśrayī na guṇavān ityādisūtreṇa [*cf.* 1.1.16] tatraiva kṛtam | parīkṣāpy[4] ayaṃ guṇo 'smi⟨nn ayaṃ guṇo 'smi⟩[f. 140^r]nn[5] ity evaṃrūpā[6] rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivītyādisūtrair[7] [*cf.* 2.1.1 *and following*] dvitīyādhyāye kṛte[[ti]][8] kimarthaḥ saptamo 'dhyāya ity āśaṅkāṃ pariharan saptama⟨m adhyāyam āra⟩bhate—[9]

· uktā guṇā[[ḥ]] ||[10] 7.1.1

guṇalakṣaṇaṃ coktam || 7.1.2

idam evaṃguṇam[11] idam evaṃguṇam iti coktam || · 7.1.3[12]

satyam—uddeśavibhāgalakṣaṇāny[13] uktāni | parīkṣā na kṛteti tadarthaṃ saptamādhyāyārambhaḥ | dvitīye[14] guṇaparī(kṣ)⟨āpi vṛ⟩tteti[15] cet—na, tasya dravyalakṣaṇādiparatvā[[t]] ||[16]

· pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā anityā eva || 7.1.4[17]

tatrānityapṛthivīrūpādīnām āśrayanāśān nāśaḥ—

agnisaṃyogāc ca || 7.1.5[18]

1 ⟨trivi⟩dhā: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). . . . dhā (*space for up to 3 akṣaras*) MS
2 guṇānām: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). guṇānnaram MS
3 rū⟨parasagandhaspa⟩rśāḥ: *em. with* Thakur. rū. . . rśās (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS
4 parīkṣāpy: MS, parīkṣā[yām a]py Thakur
5 'smi⟨nn ayaṃ guṇo 'smi⟩nn: *conj.*, smi. . . nn (*space for up to 8 akṣaras*) MS. 'sminn Thakur
6 evaṃrūpā: MS, evaṃrūpā[yāṃ] Thakur
7 °sūtrair: *conj.*, °sūtreṇa MS Thakur
8 kṛte[[ti]]: *em.*, kṛte MS. kṛtāyāṃ Thakur
9 saptama⟨m adhyāyam āra⟩bhate: *em. with* Thakur. saptama. . . bhate (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS
10 guṇā[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). guṇā MS
11 idam evaṃguṇam: MS^{pc} Thakur. idavegaṃguṇaṃ MS^{ac}
12 7.1.2 *and* 7.1.3 *printed as part of commentary to* 7.1.1 *by* Thakur
13 uddeśavibhāgalakṣaṇāny: *em.*, uddeśyavibhāgalakṣaṇāny MS. uddeśalakṣaṇavibhāgāny Thakur
14 dvitīye: MS^{pc} Thakur. dvitīya MS^{ac}
15 °parī(kṣ)⟨āpi vṛ⟩tteti: *em.*, °parī(kṣ). . . tteti (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS. °parīkṣoktet Thakur
16 °paratvā[[t]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °paratvā MS
17 7.1.4 *printed as part of commentary to* 7.1.1 *by* Thakur
18 7.1.5 *printed as part of commentary to* 7.1.1 *by* Thakur

ghaṭanāśe tadrūpādīnāṃ nāśadarśanāt, āpākanikṣiptaghaṭāgnisaṃyogānantaraṃ śyāmādivināśadarśanāc ca | tatrāpy āśrayanāśād eva naśyantīti cet—na, mānābhāvāt | vimatā rūpādayo ghaṭanāśanāśyāḥ, ghaṭarūpāditvāt, naṣṭaghaṭarūpādivad iti cet—na, ghaṭāntaranāśanāśyatvasiddhyāpy asya caritārthat⟨vād, ā⟩(p)āko[19]ddhārānantaraṃ sa evāyaṃ ghaṭa iti pratyabhijñā[[nā]]c ca ||[20]

[[guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt ||]] 7.1.6[21]

yadi vahnisaṃyogāt prācīnaśyāmādayo na nivartante, na tarhi raktādīnām udbhavaḥ sambhavati ||

· etena nityeṣv apy anityatvam uktam ||· 7.1.7

etenāgnisaṃyogā[[d]][22] rūpāntarādiprādurbhāvena pārthivaparamāṇurūpādīnām apy anityatvaṃ samarthanīyam ||

· apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityatvaṃ dravyanityatvāt || 7.1.8

salilaparamāṇurūparasasparśāḥ, tejaḥparamāṇurūpasparśau, vāyuparamāṇusparśaś ca[23]—ete na naśyanti paramāṇūnāṃ nityatvena rūpādināśahetor āśrayanāśasyābhāvāt | agnisaṃyogas tannāśahetur iti cet—na, sahasraśo 'gnisaṃyoge 'pi pūrvarūpādyaparāvṛtteḥ ||[24]

· anityeṣv anityā dravyānityatvāt || 7.1.9

[f. 140ᵛ] anityeṣūdakatejovāyuṣu vartamānā[25] rūpādayo 'py anityāḥ,[26] āśrayanāśasya tannāśahetoḥ sattvāt ||

· kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyām || 7.1.10

pākajāś ca || 7.1.11

dvividhā[27] pṛthivī—kāryā nityā ca | tatra kāryapṛthivyāṃ rūpādayaḥ kāryāḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāś ca | tathā hi—pārthivaparamāṇurūparasagandhasparśebhyaḥ pārthive[28] dvyaṇuke rūparasagandhasparśāḥ, tebhyas tryaṇuke, tebhyaś caturaṇuke | evam antyāvay[[av]]i[29]paryantam | pākajāś cāpākanihitakumbhādirūpādīnām

19 °t⟨vād. ā⟩(p)āko°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °t... (p)āko° (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS
20 pratyabhijñā[[nā]]c ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), pratyabhijñāc ca MS
21 7.1.6 *omitted in* MS *and* Thakur
22 °saṃyogā[[d]]: *conj.*, °saṃyoga° MS, °saṃyogato Thakur
23 °sparśaś ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °sparśac ca MS
24 °parāvṛtteḥ: MS, °parāpṛtteḥ Thakur
25 vartamānā: *em.*, vartamāna(°) MS Thakur
26 anityāḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), anityaḥ MS
27 dvividhā: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), dvividham MS
28 pārthive: MS, pārthiva° Thakur
29 antyāvay[[av]]i°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), antyāvayi° MS

anvayavyatirekābhyām agnisaṃyogajatvāvadhāraṇāt, pārthivāṇurūpādīnām anityatve saty aśrāvaṇatve sati nityaviśeṣaguṇatvena buddhyādivat saṃyogajatvānumānāt | tasmāt kvacit kāryapṛthivyāṃ rūpādayaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ. kvacit pākajāḥ | pārthivaparamāṇuṣu pākajā eva ||

ātreyapraśastapādādayas tu kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyām iti sūtraṃ kāryapṛthivīrūpādīnāṃ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakatvapratipādakam. vahnisaṃyogajāś ceti[30] sūtraṃ tu paramāṇupṛthivīrūpādīnāṃ pākajatvapratipādakam iti vyācakṣate prakriyā tu—prathamakṣaṇe vahnyabhighātān nodanād vāpākanihitakumbhādiparamāṇuṣu dvyaṇukārambhaka⟨saṃyo⟩ga[31] virodhivibhāgārambhakaṃ karma. dvitīye[32] kṣaṇe dvyaṇukārambhakasaṃyogavirodhivibhāgaḥ. tṛtī[[ya]][33] kṣaṇe dvyaṇukārambhakasaṃyoganāśa(ḥ), ⟨caturthakṣaṇe⟩[34] dvyaṇukanāśaḥ. pañcamakṣaṇe paramāṇuśyāmādīnām agnisaṃyogā[[n]][35] nāśaḥ, sakriyasya paramāṇor ākāśādinā vibhāgajavibhāgaś ca,[36] ṣaṣ⟨ṭhakṣaṇe 'nyasmād agni⟩[f. 141v]saṃyogād[37] raktādīnām utpattiḥ paramāṇor ākāśādinā pūrvasaṃyoganivṛttiś ca. saptamakṣaṇe paramāṇvantareṇa saṃyogaḥ, aṣṭame[38] kṣa⟨ṇe dvyaṇu⟩kotpattiḥ.[39] navamakṣaṇe kāraṇaguṇapūrvakakrameṇa dvyaṇuke rūpād[[y]]utpattir[40] iti tad ayuktam, pramāṇābhāvāt, pratyabhijñāvirodhasyoktatvāc ca ||

· apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ || 7.1.12

kāryodakādau rūpādayaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ, udakādyavayavarūpādibhir u[[da]]kādyavayavirūpādyārambhasya[41] pratyakṣasiddhatvāt ||

· pākajā na vidyante || · 7.1.13[42]

kāryodakādirūpādayo nāgnisaṃyogajāḥ, udakādirūpāditvāt. udakaparamāṇvādirūpādivat | udakaparamāṇvādirūpādayo na pākajāḥ, nityatvāt, gaganavat

30 °saṃyogajāś ceti: MS. °saṃyog[āt pāka]jāś ceti Thakur
31 °⟨saṃyo⟩ga°: *em. with* Thakur. °. . . ga° (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS
32 dvitīye: MS. dvitīya° Thakur
33 tṛtī[[ya]]°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). tṛtī° MS
34 ⟨caturthakṣaṇe⟩: *em. with* Thakur. . . . (*space for up to 5 akṣaras, but probably not enough for* caturthe kṣaṇe) MS
35 °saṃyogā[[n]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °saṃyogā MS
36 °vibhāgaś ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °vibhāgañ ca MS
37 ṣaṣ⟨ṭhakṣaṇe 'nyasmād agni⟩saṃyo[[gā]]d: *conj.*, ṣaṣ. . . saṃyod (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, ṣaṣṭha[kṣaṇe bhogyadṛṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇu]saṃyogād Thakur
38 aṣṭame: MS, aṣṭama° Thakur
39 kṣa⟨ṇe dvyaṇu⟩kotpattiḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*) (°kṣaṇe [dvyaṇu]kotpattiḥ), kṣa. . . kotpattiḥ (*space for up to 4 akṣaras*) MS
40 rūpād[[y]]utpattir: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). rūpādutpattir MS
41 u[[da]]kādyavayavirūpādyārambhasya: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). ūkādyavayavirūpādyārambhakasya MS
42 7.1.13 *printed as part of the commentary on* 7.1.12 *by* Thakur

· [[aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt]][43] karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.14

dravyaṃ hi guṇānāṃ samavāyikāraṇam | na ca guṇakarmaṇī[44] dravyam,[45] ato na tatra guṇārambhaḥ | guṇakarmaṇī na[45] guṇavatī, adravyatvāt | yad guṇavat ta[[d]][46] dravyam, yathā ghaṭaḥ | śuklaḥ paṭa ity atra śuklapratyayas tu dravye śuklaguṇayogāt, rūpe śuklatvajātiyogāt, na tu rūpasya śuklaguṇavattvāt | śuklo gacchatīti pratyayas tu dravye śuklaguṇakarmayogāt, na tu karmaṇa[[ḥ]][47] śuklaguṇavattvāt ||

etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ ||[48] 7.1.15

etena dravyasya guṇārambhapratipādanena ||

· ekadravyatvāc ca || 7.1.16

śyāmaraktādīnāṃ virodho deśabhedena vā kālabhedena vā parihāryaḥ | na caiṣā[[ṃ]][49] deśabhedo 'sti, ekadravyāśritatvāt | tasmāt kālabhedena virodhaparihāraḥ | tasmāc chyāmādinivṛttyanantaraṃ śyāmādi[[ni]]vṛttisamaye[50] vā raktādīnām utpattiḥ ||

· aṇo[[r]][51] mahataś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || · 7.1.17

caturthādhyāya iti śeṣaḥ | aṇor [[an]]upalabdhiḥ, mahata upalabdhiḥ |[52] caturthe hi mahaty anekadravya[[vat]]tvād[53] rūpāc copalabdhiḥ [4.1.5], adravya[[vat]]tvāt[54] paramāṇāv anupalabdhiḥ [4.1.6] iti sūtradvayam ||

kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || · 7.1.18

kāraṇabahutvād[55] yathā apracitadvyaṇukatrayārabdhatryaṇuke, tasya kāraṇasya mahattvābhāvāt pracayābhāvāc ca | kāraṇamahattvād yathā apracitatantudvayārabdhadvitantukādau, tatra kāraṇabahutvapracayābhāvāt | pracayaviśeṣaḥ kāraṇapracayaḥ, tasmād yathā pracitatryaṇukadvayārabdhakāryadravye, tatra kāraṇabahutvābhāvāt kāraṇamahattvasya sato 'py akāraṇatvāt | · kāraṇabahutvamahattvābhyāṃ mahattvaṃ · yathā apracitatulyamahattvatantutrayārabdhatritantukādau |

43 [[aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt]] *conj.*, *om.* MS Thakur
44 guṇakarmaṇī: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), guṇakarmāṇi MS
45 dravyam ato na tatra guṇārambhaḥ guṇakarmaṇī na: MS, *om.* Thakur
46 ta[[d]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ta MS
47 karmaṇa[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), karmmaṇa MS
48 pākajā vyākhyātāḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), pākajādyākhyātāḥ MS
49 caiṣā[[ṃ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), caiṣā MS
50 śyāmādi[[ni]]vṛttisamaye: *conj.*, śyāmādivṛttisamavāye MS, śyāmādivati samavāyena Thakur
51 aṇo[[r]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), aṇo MS
52 aṇor a[[nu]]palabdhiḥ mahata upalabdhiḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), aṇor upalabdhiḥ mahato nupalabdhiḥ MS
53 anekadravya[[vat]]tvād: *em.*, anekadravyatvād MS Thakur
54 adravya[[vat]]tvāt: *em.*, adravyatvāt MS Thakur
55 kāraṇabahutvād: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), kāraṇamahatvād MS

· kāraṇabahutvapracayābhyāṃ mahattvaṃ yathā pracitatryaṇukārabdhakārya-dravye | kāraṇabahutvakāraṇamahattvakāraṇapracayebhyo[56] mahattvaṃ yathā pracitatantutrayārabdhatritantukādau ||

· tadviparītam aṇu || · 7.1.19[57]

tasmān mahattvāt[56] kāraṇabahutvamahattvapracayajanyād viparītam ||

· aṇu mahad iti tasmin vi⟨ś⟩e⟨ṣa⟩bhāvād[58] viśeṣābhāvāc ca || · 7.1.20

tasmin prasiddhāmalakādāv aṇuvyavahāro [[bilvaparimāṇāpekṣayā]][59] mahattva-prakarṣābhāvaguṇayogāt,[60] śā⟨strasiddhadvyaṇu⟩k⟨e⟩[61] mahad iti vyavahāro 'pi paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaguṇayogāt ||

mukh[[y]]e[62] bādhakam āha—

· ekakālatvāt || 7.1.21

aṇumahattva⟨yor virodha⟩[f. 142ʳ]parihāro[63] dharmibhedāt kālabhedād vā | · nātra dharmibhedaḥ, bilvāmalakadvyaṇukāder ekatvāt | nāpi kālabhedaḥ, aṇumahadvyavahārayor[64] eka(k)⟨ālatvāt ||

ka⟩tham[65] aṇutvamahattvayor virodhaḥ | ata āha—

· dṛṣṭāntāc ca || · 7.1.22

yad aṇu na tan mahat, yathāṇuḥ,[66] yan mahat tan nāṇu, yathākāśam iti paraspara-parihāreṇaivopalambhād virodha[[ḥ]][67] śītoṣṇasparśayor iva ||

56 kāraṇabahutvakāraṇamahattvakāraṇapracayebhyo... mahattvāt (*in commentary on 7.1.19*): MS, om. Thakur

57 7.1.19 *om.* Thakur (*see previous note*)

58 vi⟨ś⟩e⟨ṣa⟩bhāvād: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), vi...bhāvād (*space for 2 akṣaras, the first of which had medial* e) MS

59 [[bilvaparimāṇāpekṣayā]]: *conj., om.* MS Thakur

60 mahattvaprakarṣābhāvaguṇayogāt: MS^{pc}; *after* °pra° *the scribe first wrote* °cayajanyād viparītam · aṇu mahad iti (*eyeskip backward*) *then cancelled all this by bracketing it*, mahattva-pracayajanyād viparītam aṇumahad iti kāryābhāvaguṇayogāt Thakur

61 śā⟨strasiddhadvyaṇu⟩k⟨e⟩: *conj.*, ga...ka (*space for up to 5 akṣaras*) MS, [gaganamahattvāpa-kṛṣṭamahattvake tasmin] Thakur

62 mukh[[y]]e: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), mukhe MS

63 aṇumahattva⟨yor virodha⟩parihāro: *em.*, aṇumahatva... parihāro (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, aṇutvamahattvayoḥ virodhaparihāro Thakur

64 aṇumahadvyavahārayor: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), aramahadvyavahārayor MS

65 eka(k)⟨ālatvāt || ka⟩tham: *em.*, eka(k)...tham (*space for up to 4 akṣaras*) MS, eka[kālatvāt, ekatra sadbhāve ka]tham Thakur

66 yathāṇuḥ: MS, yathāṇu Thakur

67 virodha[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur, virodha MS

· aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvaḥ karmaguṇai[[r]][68] vyākhyātaḥ || 7.1.23

aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.24[69]

guṇakarmaṇī nāṇutva[70]mahattvavatī, adravyatvāt, aṇutvamahattvavat ||

etena dīrghatvahrasvatvayor upalabdhyanupalabdhī[71] nitye vyākhyāte || 7.1.25

· karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.26

guṇair guṇāḥ ||· 7.1.27

vyākhyātā iti śeṣaḥ | karmabhir dṛṣṭāntair guṇaiś ca dṛṣṭāntair[72] dīrghatvahrasvatvayoḥ karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ | dīrghatvahrasvatve na karmavatī nāpi śuklādimatī, adravyatvāt, karmavat, śuklādivac ca ||

· etad anityam ||· 7.1.28

etac caturvidham[73] utpādyaṃ parimāṇam anityaṃ vināśi | kiṃ vināśakāraṇam ity atrāpy etad evottaram—·etad anityam |[73] etad iti kāryacaturvidhaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyaṃ parāmṛśati | tataś cāśrayanāśāt kāryacaturvidhaparimāṇanāśa iti sūtrārthaḥ ||

· nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam ||· 7.1.29

paramāṇuparimāṇaṃ nityam avināśi | katham ity atrāpy etad evottaram— ·nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam | parimaṇḍalam asyāstīti parimaṇḍalaṃ paramāṇu[[ḥ]] |[74] tenāśrayanāśābhāvāt[75] paramāṇuparimāṇaṃ nityam ||

· avidyā vidyāliṅgam ||[76] · 7.1.30

avidyā vyāptismṛtiḥ, smṛter avidyātvāt | vidyā pakṣa[[dharma]]tva[77]pratītiḥ | hrasvatvāṇutvayor iti śeṣaḥ | dvyaṇukam aṇutvā[[ti]]rikta[78]parimāṇa[f. 142ᵛ]vat, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavat ||

68 karmaguṇai[[r]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). karmmaguṇe MS
69 *Before* 7.1.24, *which is printed as part of commentary* Thakur *conjecturally adds a sūtra* [aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ]
70 nāṇutva°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). hāṇutva° MS
71 upalabdhyanupalabdhī: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). upalabdhyanupalabdhi MS
72 dṛṣṭāntair: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). dṛṣṭāntai MS
73 etac caturvidham··· etad anityam: MS. *om.* Thakur (eyeskip)
74 paramāṇu[[ḥ]]: *em.*, paramāṇu MS Thakur
75 °nāśābhāvāt: *em. with* Thakur^pc. °nānābhāvāt MS. °nānā[tvā]bhāvāt Thakur^ac
76 avidyā vidyāliṅgam: MS. avidyā ca vidyāliṅgam Thakur
77 pakṣa[[dharma]]tva°: *conj.*, pakṣatva° MS Thakur
78 aṇutvā[[ti]]rikta°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). aṇutvārikta° MS

· vibhavān mahān ākāśas tathā cātmā || 7.1.31

tadabhāvād aṇu manaḥ || 7.1.32

vibhavo yugapat sarvamūrtadravyasaṃyogaḥ | cakāro 'nuktadīrghatvādisamuccayārthaḥ | mano 'ṇu, avibhutve[79] sati nityadravyatvāt, udakaparamāṇuvat |

· guṇair dig vyākhyātā ||[80] 7.1.33

sarvagatā[81] parama[[ma]]hatī[82] ceti śeṣaḥ ||

kāraṇena kālaḥ ||· 7.1.34

paratvāparatvapūrvādipratyayakāraṇena diśā kālaḥ sarvagataḥ paramamahāṃś ca vyākhyātaḥ ||

iti saptamasya prathamam āhnikam ||[83]

79 avibhutve: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). avihutve MS
80 dig vyākhyātā: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). dik vyākhyātāḥ MS
81 sarvagatā: *em.*, sarvagata(°) MS Thakur
82 parama[[ma]]hatī: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). paramahatī MS
83 iti saptamasya prathamam āhnikam: MS (*there is a sign which I interpret as a stylized śrī before and after the colophon*). iti śrīmadvaiśeṣike darśane saptamādhyāyasya prathamāhnikam Thakur

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 2

rūparasagandhasparśavyatirekād arthāntaram ekatvam ||· 7.2.1

gandhābhāve 'py udakādau, rasābhāve 'pi vahnyādau, rūpābhāve 'pi pavanādau, sparśābhāve 'py ākāśādāv ekatvam upalabhyate | tasmād rūpādibhyo bhinnam | evaṃ guṇāntarādibhyo 'py ekatvasya[1] bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ ||

· tathā pṛthaktvam ||· 7.2.2

yathaikatvaṃ rūpādibhyo bhidyate tathaikapṛthaktvam api | samarthite caikatvaikapṛthaktve anekatvānekapṛthaktve ca ||

tayor nityatvānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyām[2] vyākhyāte || 7.2.3[3]

niṣpattiś ca || 7.2.4[4]

yathā[2] tejaso rūpasparśau paramāṇuṣu nityāv anyatrāśrayanāśān naśyataḥ, tathaikatvaikapṛthaktve | yathā ca tau kārye kāraṇaguṇapūrvakau tathaikatvaikapṛthaktve ca ||

ekatvaikapṛthaktvayor ekatvaika⟨pṛ⟩thaktvābhāvo[5] 'ṇu[[tva]]mahattvābhyām[6] vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.5

karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.6

guṇair guṇāḥ ||[7] 7.2.7

gatārthāni sūtrāṇi, nyāyasya tulyatvāt ||

· niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmaguṇānāṃ sarvaikatvaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.8

⟨sarvaṃ gu⟩ṇakarmādikaṃ[8] ekam eveti māyāvedāntinaḥ | tan na, sarvaikatvasya vyāhatatvāt | guṇakarmādaya ekatvasaṃkhyārahitāḥ, adravyatvā[[t]],[9] na yad evaṃ[10] na ta⟨d evam, yathā ghaṭaḥ ||⟩[11]

1 guṇāntarādibhyo 'py ekatvasya: MS, guṇāntarādibhyaḥ anekatvasya Thakur
2 rūpasparśābhyāṃ · · · yathā (*in commentary on* 7.2.4): MS, *om.* Thakur
3 7.2.3 *printed as part of commentary on* 7.2.2 *by* Thakur
4 7.2.4 *not in* Thakur (*cf. note* 2)
5 ekatvaika⟨pṛ⟩thaktvābhāvo: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ekatvaika... thaktvābhāvo (*space for 1 akṣara*) MS
6 'ṇu[[tva]]mahattvābhyāṃ: *em.*, 'ṇumahattvābhyāṃ MS Thakur
7 guṇāḥ: *em. with* Thakur, guṇaḥ MS
8 ⟨sarvaṃ gu⟩ṇakarmādikaṃ: *conj.*, ...ṇakarmmādikam (*space for up to 4 akṣaras*) MS, [gu]ṇakarmādikam Thakur
9 adravyatvā[[t]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), adra(g)yatvā MS
10 na yad evaṃ: *conj.*, yan naivaṃ MS Thakur
11 na ta⟨d evam yathā ghaṭaḥ⟩: *conj.*, na ta... (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, tan naivaṃ yathā [ghaṭaḥ] Thakur

ekasyābhāvād bhāktaṃ na vidyate ||· 7.2.9

bhāktam amukhyam | sarvavyatiriktasyābhāvāt kathaṃ tadgatam ekatvaṃ sarvasminn āropyeta vyavahriyeta vā ||

a(va)⟨yavāvayavino⟩r[12] guṇaguṇinoḥ kriyātadvator ekatvapṛthaktve mīmāṃsakakṣapaṇakādayo[13] varṇayanti, bhedābhedasvīkārāt | tad dūṣayati—

kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛ⟨thaktve na⟩[14] vidyete ||[15] 7.2.10

kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktve na sambhavataḥ, eka[[tva]]syāneka[16]kāryakāraṇaniṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ,[17] guṇatvena[18] guṇaniṣṭhatvānupapatteś ca, pṛthaktvasyāpi guṇatvena guṇādiniṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ |[18] etena jātivyaktyor api bhedābhedau nirastau ||

· etad anityayor vyākhyātam ||· 7.2.11

aneka[[tva]]m[19] anekapṛthaktvaṃ cānityayor vartamānaṃ vyākhyātam—āśrayanāśān naśyatīti ||

· anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarma[[ja]]ḥ[20] saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ ||· 7.2.12

anyatarakarmajaḥ kriyāvatā niṣkriyasya, yathā sthāṇo[[ḥ]][21] śyenena, vibhūnāṃ ca mūrtaiḥ |[22] ubhayakarmajo viruddhakriyayoḥ, yathā mallayor meṣayor vā, agṛhyamāṇaviśeṣatvenobhayakarmaṇoḥ saṃyoga[23]kāraṇatvāt | saṃyoga[[ja]]ś ca[24] dvedhā—kāraṇa[25]saṃyogajaḥ kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyoga[[ja]]ś ca |[26] ādyo yathā

12 a(va)⟨yavāvayavino⟩r: *em.*, a(va)...r (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, a[nyad eva] Thakur
13 °kṣapaṇakādayo: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °kṣapaṇakādayor MS
14 ekatvapṛ⟨thaktve na⟩: *em.*, ekatvapṛ... (*space for up to 3 akṣaras*) MS, eka[tvapṛthaktvaṃ na] Thakur
15 vidyete: MS, vidyate Thakur
16 eka[[tva]]syāneka°: *em.*, ekasyāneka° MS Thakur
17 °tvānupapatteḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °tvāt dupapatteḥ MS
18 guṇatvena··· guṇādiniṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ: MS, *om.* Thakur (eyeskip)
19 aneka[[tva]]m: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), anekam MS
20 ubhayakarma[[ja]]ḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ubhayakarmmas MS
21 sthāṇo[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), sthāṇo MS
22 mūrtaiḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), mūrtteḥ MS
23 °karmaṇoḥ saṃyoga°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °karmmaṇoḥs saṃyoga° MS
24 saṃyoga[[ja]]ś ca: *em.*, saṃyogaś ca MS, saṃyogaś ca [saṃyogajo] Thakur
25 kāraṇa°: *em. with* Thakur, karaṇa° MS
26 kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyoga[[ja]]ś ca: *em.*, kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaś ca MS, kāraṇāk[ā]raṇasaṃyoga[ja]ś ca Thakur

tantukarmajanyatantvantarasaṃyo[[gā]]t[27] tantvantarasaṃyuktākāśādisaṃyogaḥ | dvābhyāṃ yathā tantvākāśasaṃyogābhyāṃ dvitantukākāśasaṃyogaḥ | dvitīyas tu hastakuḍyasaṃyogāc charīrakuḍyasaṃyogaḥ | trividhaś ca saṃyogaḥ | co 'vadhāraṇe ||

vibhūnām ajaḥ saṃyogaś caturtho 'stīti cet—na, mānābhāvāt | vibhū mitha[[ḥ]][28] saṃyujyete, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavad[29] iti cet—na, tantupaṭādau vyabhicārā[f. 143ᵛ]t | ārabhyārambhakabhāvavirahe[30] satīti viśeṣaṇīyam[31] iti cet—na, himavadvindhyādāv anutpannasaṃyoge[32]naṣṭapaṭādau [[ca]][33] vyabhicārāt ||

· etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ ||· 7.2.13

saṃyogavad vibhāgo 'py anyatarakarmaja[34] ubhayakarmajo vibhāgajaś ca vibhāgaḥ |[35] ādyo [[yathā]][36] sthāṇo[[ḥ]][37] śyenena | dvitīyo yathā mallayoḥ | kāraṇamātravibhāgād yathā vaṃśadalavibhāgād vaṃśadalākāśādivibhāgaḥ | kāraṇākāraṇavibhāgād yathāṅgulikuḍyavibhāgād dhastakuḍyavibhāgāc ca śarīrakuḍyavibhāga iti ||

· saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.14

karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.15

guṇair guṇā[[ḥ]] ||[38] 7.2.16

iti sūtratrayaṃ gatārtham ||

· yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete ||[39] · 7.2.17

yutau saṃyuktāv iti siddhir yutasiddhiḥ, saṃyuktāv iti pratītiḥ | tadabhāvān nārabhyārambhakayoḥ saṃyogau syātām | sambandhapratyayo 'stīti cet—tarhi samba-

27 °saṃyo[[gā]]t: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °saṃyot MS
28 mitha[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). mitha MS
29 ghaṭavad: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). ghaṭavatd MS
30 °bhāvavirahe: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °bhāve virahe MS
31 viśeṣaṇīyam: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). viśeṣaṇīyamm MS
32 anutpannasaṃyoge: *em.*, adutpannasaṃyoge MS, utpannasaṃyoge Thakur
33 [[ca]]: *conj.*, *om.* MS Thakur
34 anyatarakarmaja: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). anyatarakarmmakarmmaja MS
35 vibhāgaḥ: MS. *om.* Thakur
36 ādyo [[yathā]]: *conj.*, ādya MS, ādyaḥ Thakur
37 sthāṇo[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur. sthāṇo MS
38 guṇā[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). guṇā MS
39 vidyete: *em.*, vidyate MS Thakur

ndha[[ḥ]][40] syāt, sa tu samavāyaḥ | ayaṃ paṭo naitattantusaṃyuktaḥ, tadārabhyatvāt, tanturūpavat | saṃyogābhāvāc ca[41] tadvināśakavibhāgābhāvaḥ ||

· guṇatvāc ca ||· 7.2.18[42]

paṭarūpādayo [[na saṃyo]]gavibhāgavantaḥ,[43] guṇatvāt, saṃyogavat ||

vācyavācakayoḥ sambandho[44] 'stīty ata āha—

· guṇe ca bhā⟨ṣyate⟩ ||[45] 7.2.19

na kevalaṃ vācako guṇaḥ, guṇe ca bhāṣyate, śuklādau saṃketyate | tena vācyavācakayor guṇatvān na saṃyogavibhāgau staḥ ||

ubhayor gama⟨naṃ nāsti—

niṣkri⟩yatvā[[t]] ||[46] 7.2.20

na tāvad dhimavadādipadaṃ dakṣiṇāpathoccāritam[47] yāvad dhimavantaṃ gacchati, nāpi himavadādayo dakṣiṇāpathoccāritahimavadādipa⟨daṃ gatvā tatra ti⟩[f. 144r]ṣṭhante[48] yogyānupalambhabādhāt | niṣkriyaḥ[49] śabda ākāśādayaś ca, tat kathaṃ teṣāṃ saṃyogaḥ ||

upasaṃharati—

· śabdārthāv[50] asambandhau || 7.2.21

tasmād iti śeṣaḥ ||

· saṃyo⟨gino daṇḍāt sama⟩vāyino[51] viṣāṇāc ca dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ ||· 7.2.22

balīvardo[52] viṣāṇītyādau viśiṣṭapratyayatvam anaikāntikam ||

40 sambandha[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), sambandha MS
41 saṃyogābhāvāc ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), saṃyobhābhāvāc ca MS
42 7.2.18 *printed as part of the commentary on* 7.2.17 *by* Thakur
43 [[na saṃyo]]gavibhāgavantaḥ: *conj.*, gavibhāgavantaḥ MS, na vibhāgavantaḥ Thakur
44 sambandho: MS, [saṃyogaḥ] saṃbandho Thakur
45 ca bhā⟨ṣyate⟩: *em.*, ca bhā... (*space for up to 3 akṣaras*) MS, [ca bhāṣyate] || 16 || [niṣkri]yatvāt || 17 || Thakur
46 ubhayor gama⟨naṃ nāsti niṣkri⟩yatvā[[t]]: *conj.*, ubhayor ggama... yatvā (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, ubhayo[r gatyādyabhāvāt] Thakur (*cf. previous note*)
47 dakṣiṇāpathoccāritam: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), dakṣiṇapathoccāritam MS
48 °himavadādipa⟨daṃ gatvā tatra ti⟩ṣṭhante: *conj.*, °himavadādipa... ṣṭhante (*space for up to 8 akṣaras*) MS, °himavadādi[bhiḥ samaṃ saṃyujya]nte Thakur
49 niṣkriyaḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), niṣkrayaḥ MS
50 śabdārthāv: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), śabdārtthā MS
51 saṃyo⟨gino daṇḍāt sama⟩vāyino: *em. with* Thakur, saṃyo... vāyino (*space for up to 8 akṣaras*) MS
52 balīvardo: MS, daṇḍī puruṣo balīvardo Thakur

tathāpratyayābhāvāt ||· 7.2.23

saṃdehaḥ ||· 7.2.24[53]

sambandhapūrvakatva[[ṃ]][54] pratijñāya ⟨yadi viśi⟩ṣṭapra[[tya]]ya[[ḥ]] syāt[55] saṃdeha[[ḥ]][56] syāt—sambandhapūrvako na veti ||

kathaṃ tarhi devadattapadād devadatte dhīr na[57] yajñadatta ity ata āha—

· sāmayi[[ka]]ḥ[58] śabdārthapratyayaḥ ||· 7.2.25

samayena siddhaḥ sāmayikaḥ | samayaḥ saṃketaḥ | yat padaṃ yatra saṃketyate tat tasya pratyāyakaṃ[59] nānyasyeti saṃketān niyama iti ||

ekadikkālābhyāṃ[60] sannikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param aparam ||[61] · 7.2.26

ekasyāṃ diśi pūrvasyāṃ paścimāyāṃ vā sthitābhyāṃ svaśarīrāpekṣayā saṃyuktasaṃyogabhūya⟨stvālpī⟩yastva[62]saṃyuktābhyāṃ paratvam aparatvaṃ ca janyate | parāparaśabdayor guṇavacanayoḥ[63] para[[ḥ]][64] paṭo 'paraḥ paṭa iti dravye prayogaḥ parāparaguṇayogāt ||

· kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇāparatvāc ca || 7.2.27

kāraṇaṃ paratvāparatvayor apekṣābuddhiḥ, tasyāḥ paratvaṃ saṃyuktasaṃyogatapana[65]parispandabhūyastvaviṣayatvam | ta[[syā]][66] aparatvaṃ tadalpīyastva[67]viṣayatvam | paratvāparatve na sta iti vaktuṃ na yuktam, paro 'yam[68] aparo 'yam

53 *7.2.23 and 7.2.24 printed as part of commentary on 7.2.22 by* Thakur
54 °pūrvakatva[[ṃ]]: *em. with* Thakur, °pūrvakatva MS
55 ⟨yadi viśi⟩ṣṭapra[[tya]]ya[[ḥ]] syāt: *conj.*, . . . ṣiṣṭaprayasyāt (*space for up to 4 akṣaras; bottom of first consistent with* ya) MS, [hetor viśi]ṣṭapratyayasyo[ktau] Thakur
56 saṃdeha[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), sandeha MS
57 dhīr na: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), dhīnna MS
58 sāmayi[[ka]]ḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), sāmayiś MS
59 pratyāyakaṃ: MS, prayojakaṃ Thakur
60 ekadikkālābhyāṃ: MS, ekadikkābhyāṃ Thakur
61 aparam: MS, aparaṃ ca Thakur
62 °bhūya⟨stvālpī⟩yastva°: *em.*, °bhūya⌴yastva° (*space left open for 1 akṣara*) MS, °bhūya[stvābhū]yastva° Thakur
63 °vacanayoḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °vacaneyoḥ MS (*the* e *might have been cancelled*)
64 para[[ḥ]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), para MS
65 °tapana°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °tavana° MS
66 ta[[syā]]: *em. with* Thakur, ta MS
67 tadalpīyastva°: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), tadatpīyastva° MS
68 paro 'yam: MS^pc Thakur, parayorayam MS^ac

ity anubhavāt | viprakṛṣṭatvaṃ paratvaṃ sannikṛṣṭatvaṃ[69] cāparatvam | kāle 'pi para⟦ḥ⟧[70] sthaviraḥ, aparo yuvā iti pratyayaḥ ||·

paratvāparatve guṇau, dravyakarmānyatve sati jātimattvāt, rūpavat | vimate paratvāparatve devadattabuddhije, saty apīndriyasannika[f. 144v]rṣādau yajñadattācākṣuṣatve sati devadattacākṣuṣatvāt, dvitvavat | par⟦atv⟧āparatve[71] mūrtāmūrtasaṃyogajanye, ekadravyatve 'smadādipratyakṣatve vāvaraṇādyanupalabdhikāraṇābhāve sati puruṣāntarāpratyakṣayoḥ puruṣāntarapratyakṣatvāt, sukhādivat ||

> paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvāparatvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.28
>
> karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.29
>
> guṇair guṇā⟦ḥ⟧ ||[72] 7.2.30

iti sūtratrayaṃ gatārtham ||

> · ihedam iti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ ⟦sa⟧[73] samavāyaḥ ||· 7.2.31

kāryakāraṇagrahaṇam[74] upalakṣaṇam | kāryakāraṇayor guṇaguṇinoḥ kriyātadvator jātivyaktyor viśeṣatadvator[75] ihedam iti yataḥ sa samavāyaḥ | iha tantuṣu paṭa ityādi ||

> dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratiṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ ||· 7.2.32

bhāvaḥ sattā yathā na dravyaṃ na guṇo na karma, pūrvoktahetubhyaḥ, tathā[76] samavāyo 'pi | na cāyaṃ jātiviśeṣābhāvānām anyatamaḥ, sambandhatvāt, saṃyogavat | tasmāt padārthāntaraṃ samavāyaḥ ||

> · tattvaṃ bhāve⟦na⟧[77] || 7.2.33

tasya bhā⟦va⟧s[78] tattvam | ya eva tantupaṭayoḥ samavāyaḥ sa eva jātivyakt⟦y⟧oḥ[79] samavā⟨yo⟩[80] 'pi | prayogas tu—jātivyaktyādisamavāyas tantupaṭasamavāyān na

69 sannikṛṣṭatvaṃ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), sannikṛṣṭatvāñ MS
70 para⟦ḥ⟧: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), para MS
71 par⟦atv⟧āparatve: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), parāparatve MS
72 guṇā⟦ḥ⟧: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), gguṇā MS
73 ⟦sa⟧: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), *om.* MS
74 kāryakāraṇagrahaṇam: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). kāryyakāraṇagrahaṇagrahaṇam MS
75 viśeṣatadvator: MS, viśeṣatadvato[ś ca] Thakur
76 tathā: MS, tathā [na] Thakur
77 bhāve⟦na⟧: *em. with* Thakur, bhāve MS
78 bhā⟦va⟧s: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), bhās MS
79 °vyakt⟦y⟧oḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*). °vyaktos MS
80 samavā⟨yo⟩: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), samavā... (*space for 1 akṣara which had medial a or* o) MS

bhidyate, samavāyatvāt, tantupaṭasamavāyavat | samavāyabhedasādha⟨kaliṅgābh⟩āvāc ca |[8 1] tantupaṭasamavāyo [[jātivyaktyādisamavāyād]][8 2] bhidyate, tantupaṭasambandhatvāt, tantupaṭasaṃyogavad iti cet—na, samavāyalakṣaṇābhāvena[8 3] sopādhitvā⟨t ||

iti sapta⟩mādhyāyaḥ ||[8 4]

8 1 samavāyabhedasādha⟨kaliṅgābh⟩āvāc ca: *conj.*, samavāyabhedasādha... vāc ca (*space for up to 5 akṣaras, the last of which had medial* ā *or* o) MS, samavāyabhedasādhan[ābhā]vāc ca Thakur

8 2 tantupaṭasamavāyo [[jātivyaktyādisamavāyād]]: *conj.*, tantupaṭasamavāyor nna MS, tantupaṭasamavāyo Thakur

8 3 samavāyalakṣaṇābhāvena: MS^{pc} Thakur, samavāyalakṣaṇābhāyena MS^{ac}

8 4 sopādhitvā⟨t iti sapta⟩mādhyāyaḥ: *em.*, sopādhitvā... mādhyāyaḥ śrī (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, sopādhitvā[t] || || iti śrīmadvaiśeṣike darśane saptamādhyāyasya dvitīyāhnikam || saptamādhyāyaś ca Thakur

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1

[Now,] after the investigation of [the category] motion, [the category] quality will be investigated. The sixth *adhyāya* is begun in order to investigate *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma* and *adharma*), because in comparison with [the other] qualities [they are more highly] respected.[1] In this regard (*tatra*), the authority with regard to [determining what is] the means towards *dharma* and *adharma*[2] is the Veda, and it is authoritative through its having been composed by God (*Īśvara*); hence [the *adhyāya* starts with a] sūtra which aims at expounding that (i.e. the fact that the Veda was composed by God)—

> The composition of sentences in the Veda[3] is preceded by (i.e. produced through) cognition. 6.1.1

1 Taking *guṇebhyaḥ* in the expression *guṇebhyo 'bhyarhitatvād* as an *ablativus comparationis* though used with the positive (*abhyarhita*) rather than a comparative (*abhyarhitatara*); cf. Speyer 1886 §105 (2ly).

2 Though it might at first appear a little odd that *adharmasādhanas* should also be mentioned, this terminology is already used by Praśastapāda, who remarks in the section on *adharma* in the PDhS. *tasya tu sādhanāni śāstre pratiṣiddhāni dharmasādhanaviparītāni hiṃsānṛtasteyādīni vihitākaraṇam pramādaś ca* (280.5–7). Moreover, it may also be pointed out that, among other pieces of exegetical legerdemain, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra proposes reading the very first sūtra of the VS, the famous *athāto dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*, a second time (i.e. by *āvṛtti*) assuming elision of a privative *a*, in other words as *athāto 'dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. We are then to understand that the VS is taught also to clear up doubt on the part of those who, having learnt of the existence of hells and other bad rebirths from references in Vedic texts, desire to know what leads to these, in order that they may avoid them: *atrākārapraśleṣaṇād adharmavyākhyānapratijñāpi draṣṭavyā | tathā ca yato vedārthāvagatanarakādijihāsavaḥ tatsādhanajijñāsavaḥ pṛcchanti, ato 'dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāma ity arthaḥ* (TS 8.25–26 ≈ *atrākārapraśleṣeṇādharmavyākhyāpratijñāpi draṣṭavyā | yato vedādyavagatanarakādijihāsavas tatsādhanajijñāsavaḥ pṛcchanti, ato 'dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāma ity arthaḥ* V 2.8–9; I suspect that *vedārthāvagata°* in the *Tarkasāgara* should be emended to *vedādyavagata°* as transmitted in the abridged version).

3 I emend the *vedaḥ* of the manuscript to *vede*, though not without hesitation. Thakur, and following him Jambūvijaya and Nozawa, have retained the manuscript reading, which can also be considered to be supported by the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript's *vedo* (sandhi before the *na* of the following sūtra), though this could of course well be a mechanical corruption of *vede*. On the other hand, *vede* is read by Candrānanda, Śaṃkara Miśra and the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript, and is attested by a quotation in Praśastapāda's PDhS, the wording of which is, in turn, guaranteed by all commentaries on that text. And since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself commented on Udayana's *Kiraṇāvalī*, which also quotes and discusses the sūtra with the reading *vede*, it can hardly be doubted that he knew this reading as the one sanctioned by the most famous authorities of the Vaiśeṣika system, although, unfortunately, the unique manuscript of the GKṬ breaks off a little before the passage where the sūtra is quoted and discussed. If he here preferred a different reading, it would surely have been for some good reason, and one would expect a discussion of the two readings and their merits. Instead, the commentary does not contain such a discussion, nor even explicitly support *vedaḥ*. Of course the possibility remains that this is due to a particularly unfortunate omission on the part of the abridger, or an accident of

'A composition of sentences' is as much as [to say] 'a sequence of composing of sentences' (*vākyaracanākrama*).[4] 'Preceded by cognition' [means] produced from the cognition of a soul (*puruṣa*). [Expressed as a formal syllogism, the point made by the sūtra is that] the sequence of sentences in the Veda is one which was produced from the cognition of a soul, because it is a sequence of sentences [and all orders of sentences are produced from the cognition of souls], like the sequence(s) of sentences [produced by] Kālidāsa.[5]

[Now the following] sūtra aims at refuting [the possibility that] . . . by [ordinary people] like us:[6]

transmission, and it must also be admitted that there is no decisive support for *vede* either. However, I find it a little unnatural to take the relationship of the words *veda* and *vākyakrama* in the compound *vedavākyakrama* which occurs in the syllogism below, as a *karmadhāraya*, as one would presumably be meant to do if reading *vedaḥ* in the sūtra. Nor is the parallel compound *kālidāsavākyakramavat* a *karmadhāraya* of course.
If the manuscript reading is retained, the sūtra would presumably be to be translated somewhat as follows: 'The Veda is a composition of sentences [i.e. a sequence of composition of sentences] which is preceded by (i.e. caused) by cognition,' which, though not perhaps inconceivable, seems a little unusual.

4 The expression *vākyaracanākrama* as a gloss of *vākyakṛti* is a little unexpected: all other authors who comment on this sūtra explain (*vākya*)*kṛti* as (*vākya*)*racanā*. For example Candrānanda has *agnihotraṃ juhuyāt svargakāma ityevaṃbhūtā* ***racanā*** *bhagavato maheśvarasya buddhipūrvā* (45.5–6). Śaṃkara Miśra *vākyakṛtir* ***vākyaracanā****, sā buddhipūrvā* (256.8). Vyomaśiva *buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir* ***vākyaracanā*** (Vyo[2] vol. 2 168.8–9). Śrīdhara *vede vākyakṛtir* ***vākyaracanā*** (NK[2] 509.4–5). Udayana *vedavākyasya kṛtir* ***vākyaracanā*** (KĀ 211.17). However, this is not sufficient reason to suspect a corruption here. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's wording may have been influenced by that of a verse in Kumārila's *Ślokavārttika*, *teṣām*[*] *adṛśyamānānāṃ kathaṃ ca* ***racanākramaḥ*** | *kīdṛśād racanābhedād varṇabhedaś ca jāyate* || (VI.109). I might add that I do not think that this slightly unconventional gloss allows any conclusion as to our problem of *vedaḥ* / *vede* in the text of the sūtra.
[*] Referring to subtle parts, *sūkṣmā bhāgāḥ* of words / sounds, put forward by a (Jaina) *pūrvapakṣin* in the previous verse.

5 Thakur's emendation of *kālidāsavākyakramavat* to *kālidāsādivākyakramavat* may perhaps have been influenced by the form in which essentially the same syllogism is found in some other texts: for example a Nyāya *pūrvapakṣa* within the section on *jaiminidarśana* (i.e. Mīmāṃsā) in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* : *vedavākyāni pauruṣeyāṇi, vākyatvāt, kālidās****ādi****vākyavat* (SDS 103.22–23). However, there seems to be no need to alter the manuscript reading. The parallel at *Tarkasāgara* 48.19–20, *vedavākyaṃ pauruṣeyaṃ, vākyatvāt, kālidās****ādi****vākyavat* can hardly be used as evidence without confirming the actual reading of the manuscripts at this passage: if Thakur silently added an *ādi* at one place in the abridged version, he may equally well have done so at another in the long version.

6 No emendation of the lacuna here has occurred to me which fits well with the surviving (parts of) *akṣaras*. Obviously, the required sense is something like 'refuting [the possibility that ordinary people] like us produced the Vedas.' *asmadādiviracitatāparihārārthaṃ* or *asmadādibhir viracitatāparihārārthaṃ* would provide the desired sense, or even better perhaps (though less close to what we find in the manuscript) *asmadādiviracitatāśaṅkāparihārārthaṃ*. Thakur's conjecture also yields acceptable sense, but is very unlikely to correspond to the original wording.

There is [it is agreed], to start with (*asti tāvat*), an establishing of conventions (*saṃketakaraṇa*) [of using] the words 'brahmin' and so on with regard to brahmins and so on who have arisen at the beginning of creation. And [ordinary people] like us[13]do not have knowledge of brahminhood and so on at the beginning of creation, for by mere sensory contact (*indriyasannipātamātreṇa*) [we] do not experience brahminhood and so on as differentiated from *kṣatriya*-hood and so on, and because there is no other manifesting factor [which could cause a cognition of brahminhood]. [For] in the first place, a particular kind of form is not a manifesting factor for this [brahminhood] (*atra*), because [the existence of] a particular form [of brahmins and so on which is] differentiated from [those of] *kṣatriya*s and so on is refuted by the fact that [such a form] is not perceived though it [if it existed would be] suitable [to be perceived].[14] Nor is the being born from a mother and father who were already [themselves] brahmins (*brāhmaṇabhūta*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], because this (i.e. the being born from such parents) is not possible at the beginnings of creation.[15] Nor is the being born from [atoms

13 My reconstruction of the lacuna here is consistent with the remaining *akṣara*s in the manuscript and the number of *akṣara*s which may be presumed to have been lost, while yielding, I believe, the correct sense. Thakur's, on the other hand, involves changing °*karaṇa* to °*karo*, does not agree with the size of the lacuna, forces him to alter the subsequent °*brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt* of the manuscript to °*brāhmaṇatvādyanubhavāt*, and, for all that, still does not seem to me to be satisfactory from the point of view of sense and coherence.

14 It is clear that this is the intended sense, and that Thakur's emendation °*viśeṣasya yogyānupalambha*° for the transmited °*viśeṣasyāyogyānupalambha*° is correct. The attribution of the fault of *yogyānupalabdhi* is of course regularly made by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in arguments; an instance which employs the same wording we have here is *tad api na, yāgāvyavahitottarakṣaṇe svargasya yogyānupalambhanirastatvāt* (TS 3.25).

15 The plural in *sargādyeṣu* is perfectly understandable, since creation is a process or phase which is repeated periodically, and the reading of the manuscript has therefore been accepted. It is however not beyond suspicion, as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra usually employs the singular; cf. for instance *sargādau* at the beginning of the commentary on 6.1.3, or *sṛṣṭyādau* in the commentary on 2.1.18 (quoted in footnote 18 below).

of] elements[16] drawn together[17] by a particular *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. in this case *dharma*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], for when the *adṛṣṭa* cannot be known [as is the case for ordinary people] this too cannot be known. Therefore [it is established that] there exists a certain (*kaścit*) Lord who has direct knowledge of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us [and who] causes the [verbal] conventions [such as that which associates the word *brāhmaṇa* with brahmins] to be grasped.[18] And [it is

16 *bhūta* in the compound *adṛṣṭaviśeṣākṛṣṭabhūtajanyatvam* must be understood in the sense of *mahābhūta*. Compare Praśastapāda's account of how bodies of the *ayonija* type arise: *tatrāyonijam* (scil. *śarīram*) *anapekṣya śukraśoṇitaṃ devarṣīṇāṃ* ***dharmaviśeṣasahitebhyo*** *'ṇubhyo jāyate* (PDhS 27.23–28.2), and note that in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* on this PDhS passage we find a *pratīka* introduced with the words *nanv* ***adṛṣṭaparigṛhītaparamāṇūnām*** *aviśeṣād yonijāyonijaśarīralakṣaṇaḥ kāryabhedo na ghaṭata iti yonijam eva manvādeḥ śarīra, ity āśaṅkām apanudann upasmarati—tasmād iti* (DKṬ 657.14–16). Even more convincing as a parallel to our passage, confirming the wording of the compound in part at least, is a sentence from Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī*: *yadi vā brāhmaṇatvavyavasthāpak****ādṛṣṭaviśeṣopagṛhītabhūtajanyatvāder*** *apratyakṣatvād brāhmaṇyam anumeyam eva* (DKṬ 3.23–24). What is potentially confusing in the present case is that in the preceding compound, *brāhmaṇabhūtamātāpitṛjanyatvam*, *bhūta* clearly has a completely different meaning. I do not believe, however, that there is corruption here. The usage of *bhūta* to refer to the five elements is not found in the sūtras, but is well attested in other Vaiśeṣika texts; to give merely one example, Candrānanda in commenting on VS 4.2.3, which he reads *ātmasaṃyogas tv avipratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām*, writes *ātmaśabdena svarūpam | svarūpeṇa pañcānām api* ***bhūtānāṃ*** *parasparasaṃyogo na pratiṣidhyate, śarīre 'nārambhakatvena | pārthivaśarīre jalādīni saṃyogīni, na samavāyīni | jalādibhir ayonijam eva śarīra, ārabhyate varuṇalokādau* (35.14–16).

17 This seems the most fitting translation for *ākṛṣṭa* here.

18 Reading °*grāhayitā*, rather than Thakur's more facile emendation °*grahītā*, for the MS's °*grāhītā*. It seems impossible that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should speak of God as one who merely *grasps* (verbal) conventions; instead it is He who creates them and teaches them. The concept of God teaching *vyavahāra* to people is an old one in Vaiśeṣika; it was employed in a proof for the existence by God by Praśastapāda which we find quoted from a lost work of his by Kamalaśīla (TSP 43.1–5; cf. Chemparathy 1968, 68–72).

With our passage it is necessary to (re)consider also another, closely related, statement in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary, which has been discussed by Wezler (1982b, 96–98, referring to the commentary as anonymous). Ad 2.1.18 we read in the abridged version as printed by Thakur *asyeyaṃ saṃjñeśvarasyābhipreteti jñānaṃ saṃjñākarma | tac ca nāsmadādīnāṃ yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt** | *nāpi liṅgajanyam* | *sṛṣṭyādau manvādibhiḥ parameśvarābhiprāyavyāptaliṅgānavagamāt* | *tasmān mahādevaprasādāsāditayogajadharmasadhrīcīnamanasā vāyvādayo vāyvādipadair boddhavyā itīśvarābhimatam iti manvādibhir niścīyata iti manvādīnāṃ sarvajñatvasiddhiḥ* (22.15; for a translation see Wezler 1982b, 97). While suggesting that the ideas about creation found in this passage may go back to an earlier period, perhaps to Praśastapāda himself, Wezler states that 'according to this theory, God does not himself teach language to the first men (i.e. by indicating the objects and uttering their designations); rather, his intention has to be cognized, and this cannot be accomplished by 'mere mortals', for God's intention can neither be perceived nor inferred; only persons who are endowed

also established that] there exist certain [extraordinary persons] who have direct knowledge—attained through His favour—of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us, [and who] grasp the [verbal] conventions [created and revealed by God].

The authoritive nature of the Vedas having been [thus] established, [the *sūtrakāra*] begins [the following sequence of sūtras] in order to expound the means towards *dharma* which is expounded by those [Vedic texts]:

> Giving, preceded by [orthodoxly pious] cognitions [, is a means towards obtaining *dharma*]. 6.1.4

[The word] *dadāti* [which when inflected as a noun ordinarily refers to the verbal root (*dhātu*) √*dā*] is used [here] by secondary usage (*lakṣaṇayā*) to mean that which is designated by [that] verbal root [√*dā*].[19] [And] 'cognition' [here means] orthodoxly pious cognition (*āstikyabuddhi*). Giving preceded by faith, is a means to-

with a peculiar faculty of cognition can have insight into it, and it is they who, in their turn, teach all others how to speak' (1982b, 98). This interpretation of the commentary on 2.1.18, according to which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's theory on the origin of language would differ importantly from that of Praśastapāda and of Udayana, would contradict the reading I have restored here ad 6.1.3. However, the fuller version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, which was not available to Wezler, though itself corrupt, shows that the abridged version as preserved most probably does not make Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's full intentions clear, and that this passage too in its original form referred to God as the teacher of verbal conventions. See especially the following sentence, omitted from the abridgement: *tasmān mahādeva eva sanakādīn anugṛhya vāyvādayo vāyvādipadaiḥ pratipādanīyā iti svābhiprāyagocaraṃ sākṣātkāraṃ teṣām utpādayatīty abhyupagantavyam* (*Tarkasāgara* 220.18–19). This illustrates strikingly the uncertainties involved in reading the abridged version, and the fact that the original intention of many passages may well have become obscured.

• Thus the edition, but text has been lost here due to eyeskip, and Thakur has emended silently. For *nāsmadādīnāṃ yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* read *na yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyajanyaṃ parābhiprāyasya yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* with the manuscript: this agrees almost exactly with *Tarkasāgara* 220.12–14 (where for [*nna*] read *na*), with the sole exception that there the final compound ends in °*vedyatvānabhyupagamāt* rather than °*vedyatvāsambhavāt*, a difference which does not materially affect the sense.

19 In taking *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*, *dāna* Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra differs from Candrānanda, who understands the word as referring to *smārta* prescriptions of giving (*dānavidhi*). Śaṃkara Miśra tries to have things both ways; first he glosses *dadātiḥ* as *svargakāmo gāṃ dadyād ityādau yad dānapratipādanam* (257.12), but subsequently he adds *dadātir iti dhātunirdeśo dhātvarthaṃ dānam upalakṣayati* (258.3–4). A different interpretation is followed by Vyomaśiva, who understands *dadātiḥ* as meaning the word *dadāti*: *evaṃ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ dadātiśabdaḥ dadātītyuktatvāt, ubhayābhimatadadātiśabdavat*• (MS f. 193r8, Vyo^1 581.20–22, Vyo^2 vol. 2 168.11–13).

• Thus the MS: *evaṃ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiśabdo dadātītyuktatvāt, ubhayābhimatadadātītiśabdavat* Vyo^1, *evaṃ* [(*vede?*) *buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiśabdaḥ dadātītyuktatvād ubhayābhimatadadātītiśabdavat* (sic) Vyo^2.

One must grant Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra that, first of all, Śabara too uses *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*,

> And [the composition of sentences in the Veda can] not [have been produced] from the cognitions of [ordinary] people like us;[7] [this fact is][8] the inferential mark of the *ṛṣi*. 6.1.2

Since it is denied that cognitions of [ordinary] people [like us] can have produced the sentences [of the Veda][9] the sentences of the Veda are an inferential mark for [the existence of] a cognition belonging to a person different from [and superior to] such [ordinary people like us]. And this [different person][10] is the blessed (*bhagavān*) *ṛṣi* [who in this case must be taken to be] God (*īśvara*).[11]

> The knowledge that [the word *brāhmaṇa* has been conventionally assigned by God to denote] brahmins[12] is the inferential mark of the extraordinay accomplishment/power [of certain human beings]. 6.1.3

7 I see no better way to make the sūtra yield tolerable sense and remain consistent with the thrust of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary than to emend the *sa vāsmadbuddhibhyo* of the MS to *na cāsmadbuddhibhyo* as in the version of Candrānanda and both the Ahmedabad and Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts (Śaṃkara Miśra does not know the sūtra). The same emendation was made by Jambūvijaya. The corruption may have been mechanical, though it cannot be explained purely on the basis of the characteristics of Malayalam script: the confusion of *na* / *sa* is likely enough, but that of *ca* / *va* rather suggests transmission in Devanāgarī or another Northern script. Thakur's conjecture *sa vā asmadbu[ddhyanyo]*, retained by Nozawa, is unsatisfactory and, to me, unclear. I do not see what *sa* is meant to refer to; *buddhi* is feminine, and if *veda*, *krama* or even *īśvara* were meant, the compound *asmadbuddhyanya* is strange as a predicate. Furthermore, given the possibility of doing so, the ablative, which is also found in all other versions of the sūtra, should be maintained. The *vā* of the manuscript which Thakur retains also seems meaningless and suspect.

8 Translating as if there were an *iti* in the text. From his commentary, it seems that Candrānanda interpreted the sūtra in a very similar fashion, and indeed it is hard to see how else to take it.

9 The compound *asmadādibuddhivākyajanakatvasya* is a little unnatural, but in this case I have not chosen for Thakur's—understandable—emendation, *asmadādibuddher vākyajanakatvasya*.

10 The restoration *liṅgam* seems virtually certain, and is confirmed by the remaining traces of medial *i* on the first lost syllable. *sa ca* is also fairly convincing, I think: this would fit well in the remaining space and provides the connection to the previous sentence which one feels is required. Thakur's restoration, though providing adequate sense, is inconsistent with the *anusvāra* of *vedavākyaṃ* which is preserved (though it was apparently omitted in the transcript), the traces of the medial *i* and the available space.

11 Like Candrānanda, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra takes *ṛṣi* in the sūtra as referring to God; a highly implausible interpretation.

12 This interpretation of *brāhmaṇasaṃjñāsiddhi* is based largely on the commentary on 2.1.18 (numbered 2.1.17 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version), where we read *saṃjñā karma viṣayo 'syeti saṃjñā, iyam asya saṃjñeti jñānam* (TS 219.29 ≈ V 21.16), and the commentary on 2.1.19 (2.1.18 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version), where we find *saṃjñākarma nāma* | (?) *asyeyaṃ saṃjñā [iti] mahādevābhiprāyaniṣkrāntam* (TS 220.12 ≈ *asyeyaṃ saṃjñeśvarasyābhipreteti saṃjñākarma* V 22.1). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's understanding of the term is briefly discussed by Wezler (1982b, 97).

There is [it is agreed], to start with (*asti tāvat*), an establishing of conventions (*saṃketakaraṇa*) [of using] the words 'brahmin' and so on with regard to brahmins and so on who have arisen at the beginning of creation. And [ordinary people] like us[13]do not have knowledge of brahminhood and so on at the beginning of creation, for by mere sensory contact (*indriyasannipātamātreṇa*) [we] do not experience brahminhood and so on as differentiated from *kṣatriya*-hood and so on, and because there is no other manifesting factor [which could cause a cognition of brahminhood]. [For] in the first place, a particular kind of form is not a manifesting factor for this [brahminhood] (*atra*), because [the existence of] a particular form [of brahmins and so on which is] differentiated from [those of] *kṣatriyas* and so on is refuted by the fact that [such a form] is not perceived though it [if it existed would be] suitable [to be perceived].[14] Nor is the being born from a mother and father who were already [themselves] brahmins (*brāhmaṇabhūta*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], because this (i.e. the being born from such parents) is not possible at the beginnings of creation.[15] Nor is the being born from [atoms

13 My reconstruction of the lacuna here is consistent with the remaining *akṣaras* in the manuscript and the number of *akṣaras* which may be presumed to have been lost, while yielding, I believe, the correct sense. Thakur's, on the other hand, involves changing °*karaṇa* to °*karo*, does not agree with the size of the lacuna, forces him to alter the subsequent °*brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt* of the manuscript to °*brāhmaṇatvādyanubhavāt*, and, for all that, still does not seem to me to be satisfactory from the point of view of sense and coherence.

14 It is clear that this is the intended sense, and that Thakur's emendation °*viśeṣasya yogyānupalambha*° for the transmited °*viśeṣasyāyogyānupalambha*° is correct. The attribution of the fault of *yogyānupalabdhi* is of course regularly made by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in arguments; an instance which employs the same wording we have here is *tad api na, yāgāvyavahitottarakṣaṇe svargasya yogyānupalambhanirastatvāt* (TS 3.25).

15 The plural in *sargādyeṣu* is perfectly understandable, since creation is a process or phase which is repeated periodically, and the reading of the manuscript has therefore been accepted. It is however not beyond suspicion, as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra usually employs the singular; cf. for instance *sargādau* at the beginning of the commentary on 6.1.3, or *sṛṣṭyādau* in the commentary on 2.1.18 (quoted in footnote 18 below).

also established that] there exist certain [extraordinary persons] who have direct knowledge—attained through His favour—of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us, [and who] grasp the [verbal] conventions [created and revealed by God].

The authoritive nature of the Vedas having been [thus] established, [the *sūtrakāra*] begins [the following sequence of sūtras] in order to expound the means towards *dharma* which is expounded by those [Vedic texts]:

> Giving, preceded by [orthodoxly pious] cognitions [, is a means towards obtaining *dharma*]. 6.1.4

[The word] *dadāti* [which when inflected as a noun ordinarily refers to the verbal root (*dhātu*) √*dā*] is used [here] by secondary usage (*lakṣaṇayā*) to mean that which is designated by [that] verbal root [√*dā*].[19] [And] 'cognition' [here means] orthodoxly pious cognition (*āstikyabuddhi*). Giving preceded by faith, is a means to-

with a peculiar faculty of cognition can have insight into it, and it is they who, in their turn, teach all others how to speak' (1982b, 98). This interpretation of the commentary on 2.1.18, according to which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's theory on the origin of language would differ importantly from that of Praśastapāda and of Udayana, would contradict the reading I have restored here ad 6.1.3. However, the fuller version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, which was not available to Wezler, though itself corrupt, shows that the abridged version as preserved most probably does not make Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's full intentions clear, and that this passage too in its original form referred to God as the teacher of verbal conventions. See especially the following sentence, omitted from the abridgement; *tasmān mahādeva eva sanakādīn anugṛhya vāyvādayo vāyvādipadaiḥ pratipādanīyā iti svābhiprāyagocaraṃ sākṣātkāraṃ teṣām utpādayatīty abhyupagantavyam* (*Tarkasāgara* 220.18–19). This illustrates strikingly the uncertainties involved in reading the abridged version, and the fact that the original intention of many passages may well have become obscured.

* Thus the edition, but text has been lost here due to eyeskip, and Thakur has emended silently. For *nāsmadādīnāṃ yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* read *na yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyajanyaṃ, parābhiprāyasya yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* with the manuscript; this agrees almost exactly with *Tarkasāgara* 220.12–14 (where for [*nna*] read *na*), with the sole exception that there the final compound ends in °*vedyatvānabhyupagamāt* rather than °*vedyatvāsambhavāt*, a difference which does not materially affect the sense.

19 In taking *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*, *dāna* Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra differs from Candrānanda, who understands the word as referring to *smārta* prescriptions of giving (*dānavidhi*). Śaṃkara Miśra tries to have things both ways; first he glosses *dadātiḥ* as *svargakāmo gāṃ dadyād ityādau yad dānapratipādanam* (257.12), but subsequently he adds *dadātir iti dhātunirdeśo dhātvarthaṃ dānam upalakṣayati* (258.3–4). A different interpretation is followed by Vyomaśiva, who understands *dadātiḥ* as meaning the word *dadāti*; *evaṃ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ dadātiśabdaḥ, dadātītyuktatvāt, ubhayābhimatadadātiśabdavat** (MS f. 193r8, Vyo[1] 581.20–22, Vyo[2] vol. 2 168.11–13).

* Thus the MS: *evaṃ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiśabdo dadātītyuktatvāt, ubhayābhimatadadātītiśabdavat* Vyo[1], *evaṃ* [(*vede?*) *buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ vede buddhipūrvo dadātiśabdaḥ, dadātītyuktatvād ubhayābhimatadadātītiśabdavat* (sic) Vyo[2].

One must grant Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra that, first of all, Śabara too uses *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*,

wards *dharma*; this is the [real] meaning [of the sūtra]. Giving [is defined as] relinquishing [something] for the sake of someone. And it is not the case that [this definition of giving] does not extend to[20] *yāga* and *homa*, for these too are [nothing but] special types of giving. [However] Jaimini and so on (i.e. the Mīmāṃsakas) [define giving differently, as follows:] giving is the relinquishing of substances (*dravya-tyāga*) for the sake of a sentient being;[21] and they say that (*iti*) [this definition] does not undesirably over-extend to *yāga* and *homa*, because a deity is not a sentient being.[22] This [Mīmāṃsaka view] is incorrect, for [despite their contention] a deity is a sentient being.

dāna (and has other similar usages; cf. footnote 21 below), and also that though it is perfectly acceptable to take *dadātiḥ* in the sense of 'the verbal root √*dā*' or 'the expression "he gives" (*dadāti*)', to interpret it as a *vidhi*, as Candrānanda does, seems to stretch things a little. Perhaps this is why Śaṃkara Miśra chooses to use the term *dānapratipādanam*, although in the context this comes to the same as a *dānavidhi* and the example he gives indeed contains *vidhiliṅ*.

20 The sense clearly requires us to emend *ativyāpti*, an error which may have been caused by anticipation of the subsequent *ativyāpti*, to *avyāpti*. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's point is precisely that, as he defines it, sacrifices fall under giving; only if this is so does it follow that the *sūtrakāra*'s failure to mention the former neither is a fault nor implies that sacrifices are *not* a means to acquire dharma.

21 This definition of giving differs from that given by Śabara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 4.2.28 (the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* itself does not define *dāna*) in a passage which runs as follows. *atha dadātiḥ kiṃlakṣaṇaka iti | ātmanaḥ svatvavyāvṛttiḥ, parasya svatvena sambandhaḥ | yajatidadātijuhotiṣu sarveṣūtsargaḥ samānaḥ | tatra yajatir devatām uddiśyotsargamātram. juhotir āsecanādikaḥ. dadātir utsargapūrvakaḥ parasvatvena sambandha ity eṣa eṣāṃ viśeṣa iti* (56.12–16). 'Now what is the characteristic mark of giving? That one's self is separated from ownership and another is connected with ownership. In all [three], *yajati* (~ *yāga*), *dadāti* (~ *dāna*) and *juhoti* (~ *homa*), *utsarga* (~ *tyāga*) is a common [element]. [But nonetheless they differ, for] among them *yajati* is simply relinquishing [a substance] for the sake of a deity,* *juhoti* is pouring [of e.g. ghee into a fire] and so on, and *dadāti* is the connecting with ownership of another preceded by relinquishing; this is the difference between them.' Nor have I found the definition which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra ascribes to the Mīmāṃsakas in any other Mīmāṃsā text. It seems however not intrinsically improbable as a Mīmāṃsaka view, and it may be just as likely that it is not quoted from a Mīmāṃsā text, but represents Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's formulation, chosen to allow easy comparison with his own standpoint. On the distinction between *yāga*, *homa* and *dāna* see also Kane 1974a, 841.

* Compare also Śabara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 7.1.5, *eṣa ca yajiḥ, yad dravyaṃ devatām uddiśya mantreṇa tyajyate*.

22 For the Mīmāṃsā a *devatā* has no independant existence. Cf. e.g. Śabara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 9.1.60, *na devatā nāma jātyā kācit | saiva kasyacid rūpasya devatā, saiva nānyasya | yasya yāṃ prati tādarthyaṃ, sā tasya devatā* (177.17–19). Nor does a deity have more than a subsidiary role in the sacrifice; cf. e.g. Śabara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 8.1.32, *nanu devatāpi yāgena sambaddhā | na tayā vinā yāgo bhavati | ucyate | satyaṃ sambaddhā | ārād upakāriṇī tu sā | nāsau tyajyate | tasmād bahiraṅgam* (19.8–10). Cf. Verpoorten 1987, 20n.101, '[i]n the *M* [i.e. Mīmāṃsā], the gods (*devatā*) are virtually useless. The rite is effective quite irrespective of their intervention. They have a purely verbal existence,' and further references given there.

> And accepting[23] [a gift is also a means towards *dharma*]. 6.1.5

Accepting, preceded by faith,[24] too is a means towards *dharma*.

> And these two (i.e. giving and accepting) have a [fixed temporal] order, just as [certain other] things which are not dependent the one on the other (i.e. one of which is not directly dependent on the other). 6.1.6

These two, giving and accepting, have a [fixed temporal] order, just like a donkey and a pot and so on [which have a fixed temporal order] although they do not have the relationship of effect and cause.[25]

> Because with respect to qualities of [one] soul, qualities of another soul are not a cause. 6.1.7

'Qualities of another soul' [means] qualities of another soul with the exception of God.[26] [Expressed in the form of a syllogism, the point made by the sūtra is:] the *dharma* [produced from] giving which is established in Devadatta is not a cause of the *dharma* [produced from] accepting [Devadatta's gift] which is established in Yajñadatta, because it is a *dharma* [belonging to] Devadatta, like that [on which we are all] agreed [that it is a *dharma* of Devadatta's, of which we also all agree that it

23 It is perhaps advisable to keep in mind that, like *dāna*, the concept of *pratigraha* is in *dharmaśāstra* a more precise one than the English rendering might suggest. Cf. e.g. Medhātithi's commentary ad *Manusmṛti* 4.5, quoted and discussed in Kane 1974a, 842.

24 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra clearly assumes *anuvṛtti* of *buddhipūrvaḥ* from 6.1.4.

25 The idea is perhaps that though a donkey is not reckoned as a cause of a pot, only after water has been brought by a donkey to mix with clay the pot is made. The same notion is referred to by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in a passage of the *Tarkasāgara* (ad VS 1.1.7) where he considers a number of possible definitions of *janakatvam*. One of these is 'the existing at a moment, before the arising of the effect, which is not distant [from the moment in which the effect is produced],' which is rejected because on such a definition it would follow that a donkey and the like would also be 'producers' of a pot. Even if one adds the qualification that the producer should necessarily exist at an earlier, not distant, moment, the same consequence is entailed: *nāpy avyavahitapūrvakṣaṇavṛttitvam, ghaṭādyavyavahitapūrvakṣaṇvṛttīnāṃ rāsabhādīnām api ghaṭādikāraṇatvaprasaṅgāt| nāpi niyamenāvyavahitapūrvakṣaṇavṛttitvam, niyamena tadghaṭapūrvakṣaṇavṛttīnāṃ rāsabhādīnām etadghaṭajanakatvaprasaṅgāt* (TS 71.23–25).

26 God, who is a kind of soul, is omnipotent, and his qualities such as knowledge and effort or will (*prayatna*) are reckoned as instrumental causes in respect to everything; cf. for instance Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's comments on VS 1.1.18 (as numbered in Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*; 1.1.19 in his edition of the abridged version), where he writes *yathā dravyaṃ dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ sādhāraṇaṃ kāraṇam, tathā guṇo 'pi, īśvarajñānecchāprayatnadharmādharmair dravyaguṇakarmajananāt* (TS 121.8–9; the corresponding passage in the short version, 9.17–18, omits *sādhāraṇaṃ* and wrongly reads *°dharmādharmāder* which must presumably be corrected either to *°dharmādharmādyair* or *°dharmādharmair*).

is not a cause of *dharma* in Yajñadatta].[27] Therefore, just as there is no proof (*pramāṇa*)[28] that giving and accepting [and the *dharmas* produced by these] are related as cause and effect, there is also an [argument] which refutes [this possibility]; this is what is taught [in this sūtra].

[If this is the case], how [is it] then [possible that] delight residing in Yajñadatta is produced by the *dharma* residing in Yajñadatta's son [which is produced from the performance of] *śrāddha* [rites, which, by our definition above also fall under giving]? [Since this question is asked, the *sūtrakāra*] therefore says:

> Prosperity[29] [arises] from the association [which arises] from feeding [a brahmin who is] good. 6.1.8

'From feeding a good' brahmin' [i.e., in fact] from the blessing 'May your ancestors be happy' which is pronounced by a good brahmin who is satisfied [by the food

27 The *dṛṣṭānta* in this syllogism, *sampratipannavat*, may be a little puzzling at first, but seems to be typical of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style. Rather than representing a specific example of an entity which possesses both *hetu* and *sādhyadharma*, it is no doubt to be interpreted as 'like any entity on which all parties are agreed (*sampratipanna*, in obvious contrast to *vipratipanna*) that it possesses the *hetu*, all of which are also such that all parties admit that they possess the *sādhyadharma* as well.'
Another, relatively clear, example of this usage from other works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is *ātmā sukhasvarūpaḥ, parapremāspadatvāt, sampratipannavat* (DKṬ 625.25–26). A case to be noted is found at Tarkasāgara 39.11–12, *vedavākyaṃ pramāṇam īśvaravākyatvāt, sampratipannatadvākyavat*. This is no doubt the fuller form, of which *sampratipannavat* is an abbreviation, and could be based on the type of formulation we occasionally find in Vyomaśiva's writing, of which the following is an example; *anityāni vedavākyāni, vākyatvāt, ubhayābhimatavākyavat* (Vyo² vol. 2 168.7–8, MS f. 193r6–7); cf. also footnote 19 on page 83 above. In our case, the *sampratipannavat* is to be interpreted as standing for *sampratipannataddharmavat* or *sampratipannadevadattadharmavat*.
Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's usage is not unique though; the same abbreviation is met with regularly in the *Mānamanohara* of Vādivāgīśvara (writing probably a little before Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's time), cf. e.g. *vimataṃ jñānātmakam, vastutvāt, sattvāt, sampratipannavaditi* (8.5–6). A later author who uses the same phrase is Sarvadeva (fl. ca. A.D. 1650), in whose Pramāṇamañjarī we regularly find syllogisms such as the following: *vipratipannaṃ sarvaṃ kāryaṃ dikkālakāryam, kāryatvāt, sampratipannavat* (33.23–24).

28 The emendation *pramāṇābhāvavat* for the *pramāṇābhāvāvat* of the MS yields better sense than the alternative emendation *pramāṇābhāvāt* chosen by Thakur. Compare the somewhat similar *na kevalaṃ sādhanarahitam, bādhitaṃ cety āha* (DKṬ 619.3). The mere absence of a proof is not in itself something which refutes a possibility or renders it impossible. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes rather to say that *in addition to* the absence of any proof that giving and accepting (and the *dharma* which these two activities engender) are related as cause and effect, there is also an argument which refutes such a theory, namely that given in the sūtra: qualities of one human soul cannot be a cause of qualities in another soul.

29 I adopt this translation for *abhyudaya*, though it is not a very satisfactory one, from Halbfass (e.g. 1991, 72).

given him after the *śrāddha*], happiness arises [for the deceased ancestors of the person who has performed the rites and fed the brahmin].

> This[30] does not exist (i.e. occur) when a bad [brahmin] is fed. 6.1.9

'This' [i.e.] the cause of prosperity [namely the blessing of a good brahmin] does not arise when a bad [brahmin] is fed.

> [One should know a brahmin to be] bad when [he engages] in violence.[31] 6.1.10

[The words] 'know' [and] 'engaged in' are to be supplied. 'In violence' is a partial designation (*upalakṣaṇa*) which includes the theft of gold and so on. When a bad [brahmin] is fed only a fault, not prosperity, arises.

> This (i.e. the engaging in violence and so on?) does not occur in a good [brahmin].[32] 6.1.11

> With regard to a superior [brahmin] action [is to be performed].[33] 6.1.12

30 The omission of *tad* in the manuscript is no doubt due to scribal error, and was already corrected by Thakur. All other versions of the sūtra have the word, and the commentary clearly presupposes it.

31 It is worth noting that all our commentaries supply a finite verb in their interpretation of the sūtra and take *duṣṭaṃ* as a masculine accusative. This hardly inspires confidence, and one cannot but be inclined rather to suppose that the word was originally intended as a neuter nominative.

32 No commentary on this sūtra has been preserved, so that it is unfortunately not possible to say how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra interpreted *tat*. In looking for guidance to other commentators we are confronted with the problem that their reading of the passage is significantly different: both Candrānanda and Śaṃkara Miśra read another sūtra before this one which, if accepted, could significantly affect the sense. In Candrānanda's text this runs *samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ* and in Śaṃkara Miśra's *tasya samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ*. Candrānanda comments on his version with *kṛtamahāpātakasya sambhāṣaṇamātrād eva doṣeṇa yujyate, kim uta bhojanādinā | iha samabhivyāhāraḥ sambhāṣaṇam, pūrvatra* (i.e. in C 6.1.8) *āśīrvāda*, and coming to the sūtra we are now dealing with, which he knows in the same reading as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, he comments *tat samabhivyāhāradūṣaṇaṃ hiṃsādirahite brāhmaṇe na vidyate*. This reading and interpretation is suspicious on more than one count: aside from the problem of the meaning of *samabhivyāhāra* the gender of *tat* is obviously a difficulty. Śaṃkara Miśra also wishes to refer *tat* back to *doṣaḥ* in the previous sūtra: he prepares the way for this by glossing *doṣaḥ* there already with *pāpam*, and then can say here *tat pāpam*. . . (262.7–9). If Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra indeed did not know the preceding sūtra with *doṣaḥ*, I presume that he would have taken *tat* not as referring to the fault which arises in one who converses with or feeds a 'bad' brahmin but to the faults of *hiṃsā* and so on themselves. This incidentally seems to make the locative + *vidyate* construction more natural: the problem that remains is that in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's understanding (and, as noted in the previous footnote, that of the other commentators) *duṣṭa* in 6.1.10 is not a neuter noun which could be directly picked up by *tat*, but a masculine accusative.

33 This sūtra has strangely enough been omitted in Thakur's edition, though it is present in the

With regard to [a brahmin who is] more virtuous than oneself, activity should be undertaken in order to give [to him].

> In the same way 'relinquishing' of opposing [people].[34] 6.1.13

Like giving and so on, the 'relinquishing' [which is here an euphemistic expression meaning] slaying of opposing [people] and of attackers[35] is also a means towards *dharma*.

> With regard to a [person who is] equal [in merit] 'relinquishing' oneself or 'relinquishing' the other. 6.1.14

> With regard to a superior [person who attacks one] 'relinquishing' oneself. 6.1.15

This [latter sūtra][36] means that (*iti*) one should not slay an attacker who is eminent.

Thus the first *āhnika* of the sixth *adhyāya*.

manuscript and followed by a dot; this is perhaps due to a *lapsus oculi* of the transcriber, though there is no obvious homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton which could have provoked it. Nozawa also does not admit it into Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*, although Jambūvijaya had already correctly seen that it is clearly presupposed by the following commentary.

34 Before this other versions have two additional sūtras which run, in Candrānanda's text (the variants of other recensions may be ignored here), *same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ* 6.1.14. *etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyaḥ parādānaṃ vyākhyātam* 6.1.15. Though it is not impossible that the sūtras were omitted due to error in transmission, the way in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands *tathā* in this sūtra suggests that he did not know the second of them, at least; had he done so, one would expect the *tathā* to be explained with some reference to the preceding *etena… vyākhyātam*.

35 On *ātatāyin* cf. Kane 1973, 517–518.

36 No commentary on 6.1.14 has been preserved.

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 2

> [Because of the non-existence] of visible goals, the employment of visible [means] leads to exaltation: [this is known through the Veda,] there being no[thing] visible [of the results such as the being born in heaven].[1] 6.2.1

Supply '[this] is known through the Veda.' Supply 'because of the non-existence' to 'of visible goals.' To 'there being no[thing] visible' supply 'of the being born in heaven and so on.'[2] 'Employment' [means] abandoning accompanied by the

1 It will hardly surprise anyone that this interpretation, based on the fairly explicit directions given in the commentary, is not the one advocated by others who have dealt with the sūtra. But there is indeed a certain difficulty with the word *dṛṣṭānām*, which Candrānanda solves in a way which also does not immediately inspire confidence, glossing *śrutismṛtiparidṛṣṭānām*. Śaṃkara Miśra has a different reading, with *dṛṣṭādṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ* for *dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ* and with *prayojanam* for *prayogo*, but in this he is both alone and inconsistent, for in the reprise as 10.2.20 he does have the readings attested by all other versions at both places (cf. already Faddegon 1918, 348).

2 It is, I believe, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's intention to stress that the heavenly reward of gifts to brahmins (and indeed of Vedic sacrifice) is not seen, i.e. not known by direct perceptual cognition (understanding this from *dṛṣṭābhāve*), but is known (as indeed coming to be) on the authority of the Veda, and by no other means. That ordinary people, at least, know of heaven only through scripture is a common Nyāya position, taught already (by implication at least) in the *Nyāyabhāṣya*: *laukikasya svarge na liṅgadarśanaṃ na pratyakṣam* NBh² 182.25. This is of course also a good Mīmāṃsaka view; cf. e.g. the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*'s *yasya yadarthatvaṃ pramāṇāntareṇāprāptaṃ tasya tadarthatvena yo vidhiḥ so 'pūrvavidhiḥ, yathā yajeta svargakāma ityādiḥ* | ***yāgasya hi svargārthatvaṃ na pramāṇāntareṇa prāptaṃ kiṃ tv anenaiva vidhineti*** *bhavaty ayam apūrvavidhiḥ* (245.18–22 §242), which Edgerton translates 'An injunction which sets forth as having a useful purpose something the usefulness of which for that purpose is not establisht by other modes-of-evidence, is a 'new' (absolute, *apūrva*) injunction. As, "Who desires heaven shall sacrifice" and the like. For the fact that sacrifice is useful for gaining heaven is not establisht by any other mode-of-evidence, but by this very injunction alone; so it is a new injunction' (1929, 135).

This question of how we know that Vedic ritual indeed will lead to heaven also comes up in the opening (*trisūtrīvyākhyā*) section of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary, with the full version of the commentary naturally having a much longer (and more complicated) discussion which I cannot hope to do justice to here. Basically, our author's standpoint, if I understand him aright, is that the Veda is authoritative as to what must be performed and as to what the ultimate result thereof is, but not with regard to the *dharma* which plays the most important part in this process, for that, says Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, can be known only through *anumāna*, which in turn is to be learned from the Vaiśeṣika; see *nanu yadi na dharme vedasya prāmāṇyaṃ kva tarhi svargakāmo yajetety asya prāmāṇyam* | *dharmasādhye svarge tatsādhane** *ca yāge* | *tathā ca praśastapādāḥ—tasya tu sādhanāni śrutismṛtivihitānītyādi* (PDhS 272.11–12) | *kaḥ punar svargakamo yajetety asyārthaḥ* | *svargakāmo yāgaṃ kuryād iti* | *nanu yadi na yāgaḥ svargasādhanaṃ kimarthaṃ tarhi svargakāmena kriyate* | *svargotpādakadharmārtham ity avaihi* | *svargotpādako yāgajanyo dharmaḥ punar vaiśeṣikaśāstravyutpāditānumānasamadhigamya eveti* (TS

naming of a brahmin and so on [as recipient]. And thus what is meant [is in effect that] (*iti*) the abandoning of visible [means] such as gold, firewood, ghee, boiled rice (*caru*) and rice-cake (*puroḍāś*) accompanied by the naming of a brahmin and so on [as recipient] is known through the Veda as a means towards the *dharma* that is a means towards [the attaining of] heaven.[3]

> [The observance of] restrictions with regard to ablution, fasting, chaste conduct, living in the house of one's guru, wandering from forest to forest,[4] sacrifice, giving, sprinkling [of water or melted butter],[5] direction, lunar mansion, mantra and time[6] [: all these lead] to [the production of] the *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma*). 6.2.2

The word 'restriction' is [to be] taken with each[7] [prior member of the compound, so that one should understand] 'restriction [with regard to] ablution,' 'restriction [with regard to] fasting,' 'restriction [with regard to] chaste conduct' and so on.

7.27–8.2: cf. in the abridged version 1.22–25).
* °*sādhane*: em. (in accordance with the abridged version, 1.23), °*sādhakena* Thakur.

3 As may be seen from the apparatus to the edition, the commentary has been mangled to no little extent in Thakur's edition. The loss of text due to eyeskip is understandable, and doubtless goes back to the transcript, but how and why the perfectly clear and natural *prayogo* was changed to *evaṃ sati go°* I cannot say, though Thakur's use of brackets may indicate a conjecture.

4 Translating slightly freely but in general accordance with the commentary, on which see footnote 11 on p. 91 below. The commentary also is the basis for my emendation of the manuscript's °*vānaprastha*°, retained by Thakur, to °*vānaprasthya*°: see footnote 12 on p. 91 below.

5 There is nothing in the commentary as we have it to show what particular ritual Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understood this as referring to. Candrānanda glosses *prokṣaṇa* in this sūtra with *sandhyopāsanādi*, whereas Śaṃkara Miśra explains it with *vrīhīn prokṣatītyādividhividheyam* (270.10). On the noun *prokṣaṇa* see in the first place Kiehnle 1979, 8–9 (§ 10): in four of the five Vedic passages found and discussed by Kiehnle it appears to denote that which is used to sprinkle with (note e.g. *ghṛtáṃ prókṣaṇaṃ bhavati* at *Maitrāyaṇisaṃhitā* 2.1.5 and *ā́jyaṃ prókṣaṇam* at *Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 2.2.10.2) and is rendered by her as 'Vorspritzmittel.' Only in the occurrence in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 1.1.3.10 (with reprises at 3.5.4.17, 3.6.1.11, 3.7.1.4 and 3.7.4.3) does Kiehnle consider it possible that the word should be rendered as 'Vorspritzen.' The preceding and following members of the compound in our sūtra render it highly probable that it is here used in the latter sense, as understood by Candrānanda and Śaṃkara Miśra.

6 This rendering of the compound in accordance with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's directions is not the only possibility nor the most plausible one. Candrānanda takes *niyama* only with the preceding members from *dik* on, and this seems logical because the others all denote activities and thus make good sense in the context without the addition of *niyama* while it is less clear that *dik* and so on can similarly stand alone. Śaṃkara Miśra however takes the entire compound as a dvandva, and it is this interpretation that is followed not only by Faddegon (1918, 248–349), whose discussion of the sūtra is still well worth reading, but more recently by Honda in his English translation (1990, 121(52)–120(53)).

7 Here the context allowed Thakur to restore the lacuna in the manuscript in a most convincing fashion.

The restriction [with regard to] ablution [is expressed by the injunction] 'one should bath at dawn,' the restriction [with regard to] fasting' [is expressed by the injunction] 'one should fast on the eleventh day [of both *pakṣa*s of each month]'[8] and so on.[9] The guru [meant here is] God, who is everyone's teacher [with regard to what] *dharma* [is].[10] A 'forest-goer' [is so-called] because (*iti*) he sets out from [one] forest to [another] forest; [the word should] not however [be taken here to mean] someone in the third stage of life.[11] 'Going [from forest to] forest' [means then here] the activity of this [type of person].[12]

The famous day(s) of fast, on which I may here suffice with referring to Kane 1974b, 95–121.
8 *ekādaśyām* has been lost in the manuscript and restored by Thakur; an emendation in which I
have full confidence.
The injunctions are doubtless from *smṛti*; it would probably not be difficult to find *smṛti* pas-
9 sages which could be similarly cited as authorities for the other restrictions Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra
understands as being taught here to produce *dharma*.
Presumably this interpretation may be taken as implying that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes to under-
10 stand *gurukulavāsa* as referring to visiting temples.
Thakur's *sa tu tṛtīyāśramī* for the ***na*** *tu tṛtīyāśramī* of the manuscript may have originated in
11 a misreading by the transcriber, for *sa* and *na* are easily confused in Malayalam script. The
manuscript reading is clearly correct, for several reasons. First, and weakest, with *sa* the par-
ticle *tu* would be slightly suspicious, as there would neither be a clear contrast nor a change of
subject. Secondly, it seems that with his ***vanād vanaṃ*** *pratiṣṭhata iti* Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is dis-
tancing himself from explanations of the type given by Candrānanda (ad loc.), who explains
vānaprasthya with the words *śāstravidhinā* ***gehān niḥsṛtyāraṇyaṃ*** *prasthito vānaprasthaḥ ta-*
sya karma vānaprasthyam. In view of this clear disagreement it would be strange to find Bhaṭṭa
Vādīndra after all agreeing in taking the word to refer to the activities of someone in the third
āśrama. Finally, it would be inconsistent for him to do so, for it is evident that Bhaṭṭa Vādī-
ndra's explanation of *gurukulavāsa* in this sūtra is also a forced attempt to interpret the word as
not referring to a practice specifically characteristic of an *āśrama*, in this case the first (contrast
Praśastapāda's *āśramiṇāṃ tu* ***brahmacāriṇo gurukulanivāsinaḥ*** *svaśāstravihitāni guruśuśrū-*
ṣāgnīndhanabhaikṣyācaraṇāni madhumāṃsādivāsvapnāñjanābhyañjanādivarjanaṃ ca PDhS
272.22–273.1). The motivation for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra to thus twist the sense of both items is not
made explicit, but may I think be safely assumed to be that he wished to avoid any overlap
between the contents of this list and the following sūtra, where I presume that he understood
cāturāśramyam as meaning 'the different activities specifically belonging to (or prescribed for)
people in the four stages of life' (cf. also footnote 13 below). We have no comment here on
brahmacarya but that item would have presented no problems to our commentator, who might
for example have explained that the chaste behaviour meant here is not that associated specially
with the stage of a religious student but that enjoined for householders outside of the strictly
regulated periods during which cohabitation is prescribed.
Chiefly on the strength of this passage, I have read °*vānaprasthya*° in the sūtra. This is not so
12 much because of the way the word is transmitted here—the manuscript has the rather amusing
error *vānaspatyam*, and one might say that the *tya* supports °*prasthya* to some degree—but be-
cause it appears to me most likely that there is an implicit reference here to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.1.124,
guṇavacanabrāhmaṇādibhyaḥ karmaṇi ca. This teaches that the suffix *ṢyaÑ* (cf. 5.1.123) ap-
plied to words expressing properties/qualities and to *brāhmaṇa* and so on, can denote not merely
the sense of 'being *x*' (cf. 5.1.119) but also a person's activity; and the Pāṇinean tradition is vir-

[And the activities specifically belonging to] the four stages of life.[13]

'[Lead] to [the production of] *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma*)' is still valid.

And bad and good purposes.[14] 6.2.4

The construction [here too is with] the word '[leads] to [the production of] *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. in this case *dharma* or *adharma*)'. Bad purpose is a means toward *adharma* and good purpose a means toward *dharma*.

A bad purpose is a fault of [one's] mental state. 6.2.5

'Mental state' [means] intention. Thereby (i.e. with this sūtra being read in this way) the definition [is formulated]: a bad purpose is a bad (*duṣṭa*) intention.

A good purpose is a non-fault [of one's mental state].[15] 6.2.6

[This sūtra also gives a] definition: a good purpose is a non-faulty intention.

[That which] has approved[16] colour, taste, smell and touch,[17] has been sprinkled [with water together with the use of mantras] and sprinkled

tually unanimous in taking *brāhmaṇādi* to be an *ākṛtigaṇa* (cf. Birwé 1961, 10). This is the only rule that it seems possible that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has in mind, so that I think we may be confident that the restoration of the word *vānaprasthya* both here and in the sūtra is correct.

13 I presume that this is how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands the content of the word *cāturāśramyam*, partly because of his attempt to interpret *gurukulavāsa* and *vānaprasthya* in 6.2.2 so as not to refer to the behaviour associated specifically with individual *āśramas* (cf. footnote 11 above). It is also a quite natural understanding, and is at least indirectly supported, I think, by the structure of Praśastapāda's discussion of the means to *dharma*. Candrānanda's *yad idaṃ caturṇām āśramiṇāṃ karma*... suggests that his interpretation is also the same. Śaṃkara Miśra tries to deal with the apparent overlap with 6.2.2 by explaining *cāturāśramyam* with the words *caturṇām āśramāṇāṃ samānaṃ yad dharmasādhanaṃ tat tāvat pūrvasūtreṇaivoktam iti śeṣaḥ* (271.7–8).

14 I regret having no better translations than these for *upadhā* and *anupadhā*; at least they are in accordance with the explanations given in the following two sūtras and their commentary. Compare also Praśastapāda's explanation of *upadhā* as *paravañcanecchā* (PDhS 261.14). Other translations which have been given, such as Honda's 'fraud' and 'non-fraud' (1990, 120(53)) seem no better.

15 Another unhappy eyeskip has caused this sūtra and its commentary to be omitted in Thakur's edition.

16 In the present context it would be misleading I think to translate *iṣṭa* as 'desired.' Note that Śaṃkara Miśra, who alone of the commentators glosses the word, says *iṣṭaṃ śrutyā smṛtyā ca yad rūpādikaṃ vihitaṃ yasya dravyasya tat tathā* (272.6–7).

17 Thakur adds *yat* before *iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam* but this is probably only because such is Śaṃkara Miśra's reading. Candrānanda has no relative pronoun in his text, and nor do the independant *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts.

[with water alone]:[18] that [food] is pure. 6.2.7

That in which there is colour, taste, smell and touch that is approved is '[that which] has approved colour, taste, smell and touch.'[19] 'Sprinkled over' [means] sprinkled with water together with [the recitation of] mantras. 'And sprinkled [with water alone].' 'That' refers to food and so on, which [immediately] comes to mind [on reading the sūtra].[20] Food and so on[21] of this kind is a means to *dharma*; this is the meaning [of the sūtra].

> Impure is the negation of pure.[22] 6.2.8
>
> And another [type of] thing [is also impure]. 6.2.9

[Anything][23] touched by a *caṇḍāla* or other [outcaste] is impure: this is the meaning of the second sūtra.

> There is no exaltation through eating pure [food] for someone who is not self-restrained. 6.2.10

18 Though Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not make clear how exactly he understands *abhyukṣita*, as he does with *prokṣita*, and what the distinction is, I think it safe to assume that he would be in agreement here with Candrānanda (*mantrapūrvakaṃ prokṣitam, kevalādbhir abhyukṣitaṃ ca* 49.8–9) and Śaṃkara Miśra (*prokṣitaṃ mantreṇodakasiktam, abhyukṣitaṃ vinā mantram udakasiktam* 272.8–10).

19 Instead of Thakur's emendation *tad iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam* for the curious *draṣṭarūpaṃ* of the manuscript, one could also read simply *iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam*; in any case the error is somewhat difficult to account for.

20 A slightly free, though clumsy, translation of *tad iti buddhisthānnādeḥ parāmarśaḥ*, but hopefully one which succeeds in conveying Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's intention. The preceding sūtras have not spoken specifically of food and so on, but the *tat* refers to them, and it is not to be reckoned as a fault that this is not made explicit in the sūtra, because they are already 'present in the mind,' i.e. the opening words of the sūtra already cause one to think of them. For the idiom compare e.g. *nanu yady api pramitiḥ prastutā tathāpi pramityā pramāṇaviśeṣo 'pi* ***buddhistha*** *iti kiṃ tasya lakṣaṇam* (GKṬ 103.18–19), which one might translate roughly 'Objection: even though [it is] valid cognition [that is] under discussion, still, through [mentioning or considering] valid cognition, [the question of some] particular means of valid cognition [that produces the valid cognition] also comes to mind, so [you should now explain] what is the definition/defining characteristic of that?'

21 The emendation *annādi dharmasādhanam* for the *annābhi(dha)rmasādhanam* of the manuscript is not only more economical than *annam api dharmasādhanam* as Thakur reads, but also accords with the previous *buddhisthānnādeḥ*.

22 We have no commentary on this sūtra, but it is most naturally taken to mean that food and so on which do not fulfil the specifications of 6.2.7 are not pure. Thus Śaṃkara Miśra: *yad dravyaṃ śuci tadviparītam aśucīty arthaḥ | apraśastarūparasagandhasparśam amantraprokṣitam anabhyukṣitam, niṣiddhajalābhyukṣitaṃ vā, anyāyāgataṃ kṛṣivāṇijyāgataṃ brāhmaṇasya dravyam aśucīty arthaḥ* (273.4–7). Here the *anyāyāgatam* and so on reflects the fact that in the preceding sūtra Śaṃkara Miśra read the *ca* as implying an additional condition: *cakārān nyāyato labdham* (272.10).

23 It would also be possible to supply as subject '[Food and so on].'

'Not self-restrained' [means] devoid of self-restraint.

> And because there is no [exaltation] when there is no [eating of pure food, both self-restraint and eating of pure food must be necessary for the production of the *dharma* that leads to birth in heaven and so on].[24] 6.2.11

Because a special *dharma* (i.e. that which causes one to be reborn in heaven and so on) does not arise through self-restraint when there is no eating of pure [food] [it is established that] both (i.e. self-restraint and eating pure food) are [equally] a [necessary] cause for [the producing of this] special *dharma*.

> Desire[25] [arises] from pleasure. 6.2.12

While it is being experienced, pleasure produces desire for other pleasure of the same kind. [And] that [desire] too [produces a desire] for the means towards that [other pleasure of the same kind], through the rule that whoever desires a thing also desires the means towards the same thing.

> No, because satisfaction [opposes this].[26] 6.2.13

24 Before this Candrānanda reads another sūtra, *vidyate cānarthāntaratvād yamasya*, which also has counterparts in the other recensions. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary seems to me however to strongly suggest that he did not know such a sūtra, as it refers back directly to 6.2.10. His reading of 6.2.11 is not particularly convincing however, doing little with the *ca* for example. It must be said though that none of our sources has a completely satisfactory text or interpretation of the sūtras here. I refrain from attempting to discuss the problems in detail here; some remarks may be found in Part 3, apropos of the unique readings which the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript has in this passage (p. 284ff.).

25 It may be worth recalling that *rāga* is, at least from Praśastapāda onwards, not a separate type of quality but a particular sub-class of the quality *icchā*: cf. *kāmo 'bhilāṣo rāgaḥ saṃkalpaḥ kāruṇyaṃ vairāgyam upadhā bhāva ityevamādaya icchābhedāḥ* (PDhS 261.8–10). In itself, *icchā* is not necessarily bad, as the presence of *kāruṇya* and *vairāgya* in this list indicate, and it is often considered (by Udayana and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra for instance) to be a quality of God. Praśastapāda briefly defines *rāga* as *punaḥ punar viṣayānurañjanecchā* (261.11). One may however well doubt whether this sub-classification of *icchā* goes back to the earliest periods. Note that the only occurrences of the word *rāga* in the VS are in this sūtra and in 6.2.16 below: it would not be implausible to suspect that this terminology should be taken as an indication of influence from other currents of Indian thought, i.e. the 'Yoga' school (cf. especially *Yogasūtra* 2.6–7) and/or Buddhism.

26 Though not clearly marked as such by an introductory remark—perhaps because the *na* was felt to be clear enough an indication—this sūtra seems to be interpreted as an objection by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. A not unjustified doubt is raised which is supposed to be answered by the following sūtra. Note that it is only in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha* that the word *na* is found: the other recensions that have an equivalent—Śaṃkara Miśra and the Trivandrum manuscript do not—reading merely *tṛpteḥ*. Candrānanda has a correspondingly different interpretation, taking the

Supply 'because' [satisfaction] 'opposes [this].' The experience of pleasure [as a result of] eating does not produce activity towards eating again, because [only when] qualified by the absence of an opposing [factor] does it produce [such] activity. If the experiencing of pleasure is the cause of desire there would be no desire on the part of a newly born [baby] for suckling at the breast and so on,[27] for it has no experience of pleasure [before suckling at the breast for the first time].

Therefore [, since the explanation of 6.2.12 does not explain how desire arises in all cases, the *sūtrakāra*] says—

And through *adṛṣṭa*. 6.2.14

A newly born person's remembrance of pleasure experienced in a previous life, which is produced from[28] a mental trace and [a particular] *adṛṣṭa* is the cause of desire.

ablative as indicating yet another cause of *rāga*: *yadā tṛpto bhavati tadāsya tṛptinimitto rāgo bhavati śarīrapuṣṭeḥ* (50.11).

One might wonder whether the *na* really belongs to the sūtra in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's version either. I am not quite certain on this point, but have decided to follow Thakur's decision, not merely because the manuscript places a small dot before the *na*, but also because I see no parallel for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra introducing any sūtra, let alone one which forms a *pūrvapakṣa* and not an answer to one, with merely the word *na*.

Several other recensions—that of Candrānanda, Śaṃkara Miśra and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript—read a sūtra *tanmayatvāt* (*tanmayatvāc ca* Śaṃkara Miśra) before this. From Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary below, however, it seems that the omission is not an accident of transmission or abridgement.

27 One might consider emending *stanyapānādau* for *stanapānādau* as in the manuscript, arguing that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is likely to have had *Nyāyasūtra* 3.1.21 (3.1.20 in Ruben's text) in his mind, where an argument for the existence of an eternal soul is given in the words *pretyāhārābhyāsakṛtāt stanyābhilāṣāt*, on which Pakṣilasvāmin begins by remarking ***jātamātrasya*** *vatsasya pravṛttiliṅgaḥ* ***stanyābhilāṣo*** *gṛhyate* (NBh 746.1; see also the sub-commentators on this passage). However the same phenomenon is referred to at some other places in the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary, and it seems that *stanapāna* is the expression our author prefers; see TS 17.21, 17.22 and 18.26. In the case of one reference the text has been transmitted in a somewhat corrupt state: Thakur prints *na hi yathā balā*[?] *svagatastanyanapānādipravṛttijanyeṣṭasādhanajanyecchājanyaprayatnapūrvakatvam anvayavyatirekābhyām avagacchanti, tathā pravṛttiviṣayagocareṣṭābhiprāyajñānapūrvakatvam api* (TS 16.17–19); here the *balā* which seems to have puzzled Thakur should obviously be corrected to *bālāḥ* and °*stanyanapānādi*° probably (though perhaps not necessarily) to °*stanapānādi*°.

28 It is with confidence that I emend *jātarāgakāraṇam* as in the manuscript to *jātaṃ rāgakāraṇam*. The manuscript reading is suspicious both because of the 'hanging' *saṃskārādṛṣṭābhyāṃ* which would be untypical and because *jāta* is virtually senseless as a qualification of *rāga*. It is true that unlike *saṃskāra*, *adṛṣṭa* is not explicitly mentioned as a cause of *smṛti* in the VS (cf. C's 9.22 *ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ*), but note that the PDhS explains the arising of *smṛti* with the words *liṅgadarśanecchānusmaraṇādyapekṣād ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt paṭvabhyāsādarapratyayajanitāc ca saṃskārād dṛṣṭaśrutānubhūteṣv artheṣu śeṣānuvyavasāyecchānusmaraṇadveṣahetur atītaviṣayā smṛtir iti* (256.17–20). Here, first of all, the °*ādi*° in the first compound allows the admission of other factors, and there is no

> By (i.e. in analogy with) this (i.e. desire) aversion is explained [as arising from suffering or from a memory which is produced from mental traces and *adṛṣṭa*].[29] 6.2.15

This [sūtra] is explained [merely by] saying [it].[30]

If desire and aversion [arise] from *adṛṣṭa* how then [does] a particular desire (i.e. one specific to a certain type of beings)[31] [arise], [in that] a man desires [cooked] food and so on, and a horse and so on grass and so on? Therefore [, since this doubt may arise,] [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

> And a particular desire [of a particular type of being arises] from a particular birth. 6.2.16

From the word 'and' [one is to understand also that] a particular aversion [too arises] from a particular birth. For by [observing] positive and negative concomitance it may be determined that a particular birth too[32] is a cause of this (i.e. [a particular]

reason why Praśastapāda or any other Vaiśeṣika would object to *adṛṣṭa* being said to play a role. Indeed, the commentators Śrīdhara (at *Nyāyakandalī* 599.16) and Udayana (*Kiraṇāvalī* 243.15) both explicitly understand Praśastapāda as referring to the factors mentioned in *Nyāyasūtra* 3.2.41: *praṇidhānanibandhābhyāsaliṅgalakṣaṇasādṛśyaparigrahāśrayāśritasambandhānantaryaviyogaikakāryavirodhātiśayaprāptivyavadhānasukhaduḥkhecchādveṣabhayārthitvakriyārāgadharmādharmanimittebhyaḥ* (scil. *smaraṇam*). For Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, at any rate, *adṛṣṭa* is an additional instrumental cause of everything: at one point in the *Tarkasāgara* we find as an argument *īśvarādṛṣṭādīnāṃ ca sarvatra nimittakāraṇatvāt* (TS 145.13). It is incidentally a noteworthy feature of Praśastapāda's account of *smṛti* that *anusmaraṇa* is one of the causal factors said to be involved in its production, though the PDhS nowhere makes explicit how *anusmaraṇa* precisely differs from *smṛti* (it is presumably a process rather than a cognition), what ontological status it has and what its causes are.

29 It might come as a surprise that this sūtra is found only in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*. Perhaps this should serve as a warning how easy it is to add a sūtra of this structure (*etena... vyākhyātaḥ/vyākhyātam* etc.) discretely; it would be a worthwhile project to examine all such sūtras with special care to determine if, as I suspect, some of them may be reasonably taken to be later additions.

30 I.e. is immediately clear with no need of further explanation. The same phrase is used by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra ad 3.2.5 (40.13); of course he is not the first to have coined it. Cf. for instance Aparārka ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 3.8–10.

31 It would also be possible to translate *rāgaviśeṣa* 'a difference in/of desire,' but this would almost require that °*viśeṣa* in the compounds which occur subsequently should be similarly treated, and I do not find the result of this quite convincing. Note that Candrānanda did not take these compounds in that way, for he explains the sūtra *yathā tiraścāṃ tṛṇādibhojane, evaṃ jātiviśeṣād api rāgaḥ* (50.17); the construction with *yathā... evaṃ* suggests incidentally that he understood *jāti* in the sūtra as referring primarily to human *jāti*s.

32 One's first impression might well be that the *api* is *bhinnakrama*, but it does make good sense here if we remember that aversion is normally not taught to arise from 'a particular birth': cf. 6.2.15 above and Praśastapāda's *sa* (scil. *dveṣaḥ*) *cātmamanasoḥ saṃyogād duḥkhāpekṣāt smṛtyapekṣād votpadyate* (PDhS 262.16–17). What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra observes here clearly applies only to a limited number of cases.

aversion).

> Activity towards *dharma* and *adharma* is preceded by (i.e. influenced and caused by) desire (*icchā*)[33] and aversion.[34] 6.2.17
>
> From that conjunction. 6.2.18

From the *dharma* and *adharma* produced by desire and aversion[35] [arise] the bonds[36] of *apūrva*,[37] and of a body and so on.

> And disjunction (i.e. liberation). 6.2.19

Supply '[arises] from the destruction of *dharma* and *adharma*.'

33 As *icchā* occurs only once in this *adhyāya*, I have thought it not too great a drawback that the translation used is identical with that for *rāga* (incidentally, Potter 1977 also appears to regularly use 'desire' to translate both words). The difference in terminology may well be significant; cf. footnote 25 on p. 94 above.

34 This sūtra is lacking in the manuscript, and there is no direct commentary on it. Hence it has been omitted, understandably enough, in Thakur's edition and the *sūtrapāṭha* attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra by Jambūvijaya and by Nozawa. But I believe we are compelled to add it nonetheless, for the simple reason that elsewhere, in the long version of the VS commentary, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra quotes it (TS 14.14–15). The commentary on 6.2.18 also suggests that it belongs here, at least if my conjecture there is correct (see the following footnote).

35 Rather than the transmitted *rāgaviśeṣa*°, retained by Thakur, it seems to me that we must read *rāgadveṣa*°. I see no reason why only *rāga* should be mentioned, nor why *viśeṣa* should be added thereto. What has happened perhaps is that due to the loss in transmission of the previous sūtra *rāgadveṣa*° was corrupted under influence of the discussion of *rāgaviśeṣa* which now appeared to precede. One might consider a yet more radical emendation, to *icchādveṣa*°, but that would be unnecessary, as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may well have explained *icchā* in the preceding sūtra with *rāga*. Furthermore, the comment introducing 6.2.20 below seems to use *rāga* in the same context.

36 Assuming that the transmitted text is correct, *bandha* may be understood either as 'the being bound with' or as 'bond.' It cannot be merely 'connection,' for that would have been expressed with *sambandha*. This is the only occurence I notice in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings of the noun *bandha* with no verbal prefix, and this must surely be of significance; just as the following sūtras deal with liberation, and are so understood by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, the present one explains the process of bondage. I take *bandha* with *apūrva* as well as with *śarīrādi*, as it is of course a very common idea that the enjoyment of heaven too is a bond.

37 It is very surprising that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should use this Mīmāṃsā term here, but I do not see a better option than to so understand him: it does not make a convincing adjective to the following *śarīra*. On *apūrva* see most recently the highly interesting discussion in the seventh chapter of Clooney 1990, called 'Apūrva and the Development of the Mīmāṃsā after Jaimini.' Like Clooney and Halbfass I have opted not to translate the term: it seems probable to me that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra conceives of it on Kumārilan lines, as a type of potency in the soul which nonetheless 'is not merely and not even primarily a quality or subordinate ingredient of the soul; it is and remains the effect and the stored power of the sacrifice' (Halbfass 1991, 309). Halbfass has convincingly argued that Kumārila's understanding of the notion is influenced by the Vaiśeṣika's *saṃskāra* and *adṛṣṭa*; cf. 1991, 291ff. and especially 307–311 (note that this chapter in Halbfass' book is a reworking of an article that appeared in 1980).

If [liberation arises from the destruction of *dharma* and *adharma* and] *dharma* and *adharma* [arise] from desire and so on, then, as they (i.e. desire and so on) never cease to arise there would never be liberation. Therefore [, since this doubt may arise,] [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

> Liberation has been explained in [the section of the VS devoted to explaining] the motions of the 'soul' [i.e. the vital breath]. 6.2.20

'The soul' [here must be taken to refer to] the vital breath.[38] When its motions were being described [in the second *āhnika* of the fifth *adhyāya*] liberation was explained, [namely] by the sūtra 'When that is absent [there is] absence of conjunction and non-appearance: this is liberation' (5.2.18). And [thus] liberation is the extirpation of all specific qualities of the soul. If one objects that since pleasure[39] is absent [in liberation, so described] it would also not be a [proper] human goal[40] and thus it is [a state in which one's] loss is equal to [one's] gain,[41] [we reply:] No, for it is [on

38 Yet another instance of the difficulty later Vaiśeṣikas had with references in the sūtras to motions of the soul. Candrānanda for his part writes *ātmeti manaḥ* (51.6).

39 Thakur's *tatreṣṭasyāpy abhāvād* (not marked as a conjecture) would never have fitted in the manuscript, which has only a small lacuna before *bhāvād*. It would be acceptable to read *iṣṭābhāvād*, but *sukhābhāvād* is I think a little more probable, and the answer to the opponent's objection is then appropriately pointed.

40 This is naturally enough a common objection raised against the Vaiśeṣika view of the state of liberation (which is also that held by most Naiyāyikas). The notion that a state in which all specific properties of the soul, including pleasure and cognition, are utterly extinguished should be one to be striven for seemed absurd to many, as is most memorably expressed in a verse which is quoted in various slightly differing versions by many authors. As given in the *Nyāyakumudacandra* it runs *varaṃ vṛndāvane ramye śṛgālatvaṃ prapadyate | na tu vaiśeṣikīṃ muktiṃ gautamo gantum icchati ||* (828.8–9).

41 This is probably what is intended by *samavyayaphalatvam*; I take *vyayaphala* as a dvandva and *samavyayaphala* as a bahuvrīhi compound. It is perhaps best to understand *vyaya* here as referring to *duḥkha* and *phala* to *sukha* (cf. also Śaṃkara Miśra's comment on the *Nyāyalīlāvatī* parallel, quoted below); both would be 'the same' in liberation, inasmuch as both disappear. The word is certainly correct as transmitted and perfectly interpretable, though Thakur emends it to a reading which I can make no sense of;* it is confirmed by its occurrence in some other passages in the same context. The earliest one I am aware of is in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, a text which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra knew and refers to, where we read *kiṃ ca yathā saṃsārāvasthāyāṃ sukhaṃ iṣṭaṃ duḥkhaṃ cāniṣṭam* (I conjecture this for the printed *vāniṣṭam*), *tathā mokṣāvasthāyāṃ duḥkhanivṛttir iṣṭā sukhanivṛttis tv aniṣṭeti* ***samavyayaphalatvāt*** *tatra pravṛttir ayuktā | tad uktam— anantāni durantāni* ***samavyayaphalāni*** *ca | aśakyāni ca vastūni nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ ||* (NBhū 594.22–26). This is by the way not a *pūrvapakṣa* in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*: Bhāsarvajña has a view of liberation which differs from that of most Naiyāyikas and is closer to an Advaitic Vedānta position. The verse Bhāsarvajña quotes is also cited, in slightly different form, by Udayana in the *Tātparyapariśuddhi*: *tad uktam—asatyāni durantāni* ***samavyayaphalāni*** *ca | aśakyāni ca vastūni nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ || iti* (NBh² 92.5–7), and a little later he continues *tad anena madhuviṣasampṛktānnabhojanadṛṣṭāntena* ***samavyayaphalatvam*** *apavargasya nirākṛtam* (NBh² 92.8–

the contrary perfectly] fitting that [liberation] is a human goal, because compared to pleasure suffering is absent in great[er] quantity[42] in it.[43]

Thus the sixth *adhyāya*.

9).
* It is possible that in this case the square brackets in Thakur's *sama[māya]vyayaphalatvam* are meant to indicate that Thakur proposes 'correcting' the transmitted *samavyayaphalatvam* to *samāyavyayaphalatvam*. The latter word occurs twice, in connection with the same question of liberation and its desirability, in Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyalīlāvatī*: see especially *na cāsya* (scil. *mokṣasya*) ***samāyavyayaphalatvenāpuruṣārthatvam*** (594.2; cf. also 595.4). The relation with our passage here is clear, but one should not be misled by the wording I quoted from the edition of the *Nyāyalīlāvatī*, as it is probably corrupt. I say this not only because I find it impossible to interpret satisfactorily and because Vallabhācārya was almost certainly aware of and influenced by the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* and *Tātparyapariśuddhi* passages, but also because Śaṃkara Miśra's *Nyāyalīlāvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* seems to support the word *samavyayaphalatva* in the *Nyāyalīlāvatī* too: see *phalasya sukhasya duḥkhasya cāviśeṣād ity arthaḥ* (595.11–12), and the subsequent quotation of yet another form of the verse we have already seen twice: ***aśakyāni durantāni samavyayaphalāni*** ** *ca | asatyāni ca karmāṇi nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ* || (595.16–17).
** *samavyayaphalāni*: em., *samavāyaphalāni* ed.

42 I find it difficult to express Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's intentions in English here, though I think they are plain enough. It must be remembered that for him *abhāva* is a separate category, and one with infinite instances. An absence is always an absence of some particular thing (its *pratiyogin*), and the absence of *sukha* is thus something quite different from the absence of *duḥkha*. In the case of liberation, the suffering that disappears is far greater than the pleasure that is also given up, and hence it can be said that the *duḥkhābhāva* therein is far greater than the *sukhābhāva*.
Though the precise form in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's answer is worded, with its use of this idea of difference in *abhāvas*, is not familiar to me from other texts, the general line of defence is a traditional one. In answer to the above-mentioned criticism of their concept of liberation Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas usually point out that human existence is after all for the greatest part one of suffering, and that the extinction of this suffering in liberation is more than worth the absence of such small pleasure as is possible in the bound state. The earliest, and one of the most elegant, surviving expression of this thought in the Nyāya school is to be found in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* ad *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.2, where the opponent's position is put in the words *apavarge bhīṣmaḥ khalv ayaṃ sarvoparamaḥ, sarvaviprayogo 'pavargaḥ, bahu bhadrakaṃ lupyata iti kathaṃ buddhimān sarvasukhocchedam acaitanyam amum apavargaṃ rocayed iti* (NBh^2 150.13–14, following the readings of the Jaisalmer manuscript as reported in the apparatus), which is answered a little later with *apavarge śāntaḥ khalv ayaṃ sarvaviprayogaḥ, sarvoparamo 'pavargaḥ, bahv atra kṛcchraṃ ghoraṃ pāpakaṃ lupyata iti kathaṃ buddhimān sarvaduḥkhocchedaṃ sarvaduḥkhāsaṃvidam apavargaṃ na rocayed iti | tadyathā madhuviṣasampṛktam annam anādeyam iti* (NBh^2 151.16–19, again reading with the Jaisalmer manuscript).

43 Retaining the manuscript's *tadabhāvāt*, which one could also consider emending to *tatrābhāvāt* or *tadābhāvāt*.

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1

[This][1] *śāstra* has a threefold procedure:[2] naming by name (*uddeśa*),[3] definition (*lakṣaṇa*)[4] and investigation (*parīkṣā*). Or [in the view of some, the *śāstra* has a] fourfold [procedure]: naming by name, (sub)dividing (*vibhāga*), definition and investigation.[5] Of these [procedures], the naming by name and (sub)division of the qualities have already been done in the first *adhyāya* with the sūtra which begins

1 The concept of the three- or four-fold *śāstrapravṛtti* seems to be peculiar to Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, so it is probably better to supply 'the' or 'this' than 'a.' Cf. *asya śāstrasya* in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* *locus classicus*, quoted in the following note.

2 The *locus classicus* for this threefold division of *śāstrapravṛtti* is in Pakṣilasvāmin's *Nyāyabhāṣya* introducing *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.3, *trividhā cāsya śāstrasya pravṛttiḥ—uddeśo lakṣaṇam parīkṣā ceti* (NBh^2 181.20).

3 *uddeśa* is explained by Pakṣilasvāmin as *nāmadheyena padārthamātrābhidhānam* (this is the reading of the Jaisalmer manuscript, see NBh^2 181 n.6; *nāmadheyena padārthamātrasyābhidhānam* NBh^2 181.21).

4 The *Nyāyabhāṣya* explanation of *lakṣaṇa* is *uddiṣṭasya tattvavyavasthāpako dharmo lakṣaṇam.** This suggests 'characteristic / defining mark' or the like as a translation for *lakṣaṇa*. Later, however, *lakṣaṇa* is of course frequently used in a sense closer to 'definition,' and I translate it in this way here, partly because of its use with √*kṛ*.
* Thus the Jaisalmer manuscript, according to NBh^2 181 n.6, supported by the *Nyāyālaṅkāra*, which gives *tattvavyavasthāpaka iti* as a *pratīka*, and the same formulation in the *Nyāyamañjarī* (NM^1 vol. 1 11.17, NM^2 vol. 1 29.8–9); *uddiṣṭasyātattvavyavacchedako dharmo lakṣaṇam* NBh^2 181.21–22.

5 The *Nyāyabhāṣya* itself already refers to (*pra*)*vibhāga* as something which the *śāstra* also teaches, but does not include it among the *śāstrapravṛttis*, nor discuss the possibility that it might be reckoned among them. Cf. for instance *tatroddiṣṭasya* ***pravibhaktasya*** *lakṣaṇam ucyate, yathā pramāṇānāṃ prameyasya ca | uddiṣṭasya lakṣitasya ca* ***vibhāgavacanam***, *yathā chalasya* (NBh^2 181.23–24). The question which this naturally raises was already discussed by Uddyotakara, commenting on the *Nyāyabhāṣya*'s introduction to 1.1.3: *uddiṣṭasya vibhāgānarthakyam, vyāghātāt | 'trividhā cāsya śāstrasya pravṛttiḥ' ity uktam | uddiṣṭavibhāgaś ca na trividhāyāṃ śāstrapravṛttāv antarbhavati | tasmād uddiṣṭavibhāgo na yuktaḥ | na, uddiṣṭavibhāgasya uddeśa evāntarbhāvāt | kasmāt | lakṣaṇasāmānyāt | samānaṃ lakṣaṇam nāmadheyena padārthābhidhānamātram uddeśa iti* (NBh^2 183.16–20). This view, that *vibhāga* falls under *uddeśa*, is also followed by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who seems to be the first to explicitly mention—and reject—a theory of a four-fold *śāstrapravṛtti*, as a *pūrvapakṣa* in his *Nyāyamañjarī*: *nanu ca vibhāgalakṣaṇā caturthy api pravṛttir asty eva, bhedavatsu pramāṇasiddhāntacchalādiṣu tathā vyavahārāt | satyam—prathamasūtroddiṣṭe** *bhedavati padārthe bhavaty eva vibhāgaḥ, uddeśarūpānapāyāt tūddeśa evāsau | sāmānyasaṃjñayā kīrtanam uddeśaḥ, prakārabhedasaṃjñayā kīrtanaṃ vibhāga iti* (NM^1 vol. 1 11.19-22, NM^2 vol. 1 29.12–16). Some later authors seem however to have accepted *vibhāga* as a *pravṛtti* separate from *uddeśa*, e.g. Jinavardhana Sūri (ca. A.D. 1410) in his commentary ad *Saptapadārthī* (5.4–8). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra here does not express a preference in the matter; as may be seen by Pakṣilasvāmin's example, the fact that in the following he refers more than once to *vibhāga* does not necessarily mean that he accept it as a distinct *śāstrapravṛtti*.
* °*sūtroddiṣṭe*: NM^2, °*sūtropadiṣṭe* NM^1

'Colour, taste, smell [and] touch, numbers' (1.1.5). [And] the definition has also been made in the very same place (i.e. *adhyāya*), with the sūtra which begins 'Residing in substance, not possessing qualities' (1.1.16). [And] the investigation, in the form of [stating that] 'this quality [inheres] in this [substance and] this quality in this [one],'[6] has also been carried out in the the second *adhyāya* with the sūtras[7] 'Earth possesses [the qualities] colour, taste, smell and touch' (2.1.1) and so on. So[8] what is the purpose of the seventh *adhyāya*? To remove this doubt,[9] [the *sūtrakāra*] begins the seventh *adhyāya* [in the following manner]—

> The qualities have been taught (i.e. named by name). 7.1.1
>
> And the definition of quality has been taught. 7.1.2
>
> And it has been taught that 'this [substance] has such qualities, [and] this [one] has such qualities.'[10] 7.1.3

[The remarks of the objector are, to a certain extent] true—the naming by name, (sub)division and definition[11] [of qualities] have been taught. [But] the investiga-

6 The conjecture *ayaṃ guṇo 'sminn ayaṃ guṇo 'sminn* seems to me a convincing one: the wording is influenced by that of 7.1.3. Thakur's *ayaṃ guṇo 'sminn* takes no account of the lacuna, the size of which accords well with my conjecture.

7 There are two problems with the manuscript reading *rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivītyādisūtreṇa* which Thakur retains. Firstly, *rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivī* is in fact the entire text of 2.1.1 (in all sources), so that the *ādi* would be meaningless. Secondly, an 'investigation' of the kind meant here, the allotting of qualities to their respective substances, is of course not carried out in 2.1.1 alone; the entire *adhyāya* could be broadly described as occupying itself with the problem, with occasional digressions, and in particular the sūtras 2.1.2–5 (*rūparasasparśavatya āpo dravāḥ snigdhāḥ* 2.1.2, *tejo rūpasparśavat* 2.1.3, *vāyuḥ sparśavān* 2.1.4, *ta ākāśe na vidyante* 2.1.5) clearly belong together with 2.1.1 and are completely parallel in their function. Therefore the singular is also highly suspicious. Both difficulties are solved if the correction *rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivītyādisūtraiḥ* is accepted, and a cause for the corruption is immediately evident: the influence of the *ityādisūtreṇa* which occurs twice immediately before. Of course the *ādi* now has a slightly different function from the two preceding cases; if this is felt as disturbing one could also consider a somewhat more radical emendation to *rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivītyādiprakaraṇena* (or something similar).

8 With the trivial emendation of *kṛte* to *kṛteti* (the error is haplography) the construction is perfectly normal. Thakur, having been perhaps deceived by the apparent locative, emends to *kṛtāyāṃ* to restore concord with *parīkṣā*, but this is too violent, necessitating two further alterations to the transmitted text: (*parīkṣāpy* to *parīkṣāyām api* and *evaṃrūpā* to *evaṃrūpāyāṃ*), while the resulting absolute construction is somewhat less natural to my mind.

9 This is the most natural way to translate the *pariharan*, though it is of course a participle of the present rather than one of the future, or an infinitive.

10 That 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 are sūtras was first recognized by Jambūvijaya. The manuscript marks off 7.1.1–3 as a block of sūtras with a dot at the beginning and end.

11 It is not clear why the order of words in the compound has been changed in Thakur's edition, especially as the manuscript reading, after the trivial emendation of *uddeśya*° to *uddeśa*°, agrees with the order in which the terms occur uncompounded above.

tion has not been carried out and therefore the seventh *adhyāya* is begun for that purpose. If [you persist in saying] that the investigation of qualities has also taken place[12] in the second [*adhyāya*], [we reply,] no, for that [*adhyāya*] is devoted to the definition and so on of substances.

In earth, colour, taste, smell and touch are solely impermanent.[13] 7.1.4

Among these [qualities], the colour and so on of impermanent earth [substances] are destroyed by the destruction of their locus—

And by conjunction with fire.[14] 7.1.5

[The colour and so on of earth are destroyed by destruction of their locus, as taught in 7.1.4] because it is observed empirically that when a pot is destroyed its colour and so on are [also] destroyed,[15] and [they may also be destroyed by conjunction with fire as taught in 7.1.5] because it is observed empirically that directly after a pot

12 In favour of my restoration *parīkṣāpi vṛtteti* above Thakur's *parīkṣokteti* are the facts that the manuscript clearly has . . . *tteti*, not the admittedly palaeographically similar *kteti*, that the *akṣara* with *kṣ* did not have medial *o* (which would have been written *pṛṣṭhamātra* and would have been at least partly preserved), and, most importantly perhaps, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not seem elsewhere to use $\sqrt{}$*vac* and derivatives with *parīkṣā* but does write, in the *avataraṇa* to 5.1.1, *caturthe 'dhyāye dravyaparīkṣā vṛttā | pañcame karmaparīkṣā vartiṣyate* (Thakur's edition 59.1, correcting *vartiṣvate*—presumably a typo—to *vartiṣyate*, which is the reading of the manuscript).

13 Again, 7.1.4, marked by a preceding dot in the manuscript, was not recognized as a sūtra by Thakur. Jambūvijaya did see that it was a sūtra, but chose to print the text as *pṛthivyādirūpa-rasagandhasparśā anityā eva*, an emendation for which I see no reason. Nozawa (1974, 472) gives the correct *sūtrapāṭha*.

14 Yet again, this sūtra—not marked in the manuscript—was taken by Thakur as part of the commentary. Jambūvijaya was the first to recognize it as a sūtra, followed by Nozawa. That this is correct may be seen not only from its presence in the other recensions of the VS but also from the fact that in the full version of his VS commentary Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra quotes *agnisaṃyogāc ca* as a sūtra (TS 89.26)

15 There is a not inconsiderable difficulty here in that the first ablative seems to give an argument for the fact that the colour and so on of a substance such as a pot are destroyed by the destruction of the pot, as taught in 7.1.4, while the second ablative, though apparently connected with the first by a *ca*, clearly gives an argument for the fact that the colour and so on of a substance such as a pot are also destroyed by conjunction with fire, as taught in 7.1.5. As the text stands, there seems to be no alternative but to take the commentary on 7.1.4, sūtra 7.1.5 and the commentary thereon, up to *śyāmādivināśadarśanāc ca*, as a single syntactic unit: something which is certainly unusual and which, to my mind, suggests some mishap in the course of transmission or of abbreviation. One might consider emending the text by a transposition: *ghaṭanāśe tadrūpādīnāṃ nāśadarśanāt* would go well as part of the commentary on 7.1.4, after *tatrānityapṛthivīrūpādīnām āśrayanāśān nāśaḥ*. However the *ca* would remain a difficulty, even considering the possibility that it is meant to be the *ca* in the sūtra.

placed in the kiln has conjunction with fire its [original colour and so on,[16] namely] black and so on are destroyed. If [it is objected] that there (i.e. in [the case of] a pot placed in the kiln) too [the colour and so on] are destroyed simply by the destruction of [their] locus, [we reply]: No, for there is no proof [that that is the case]. If [the objector attempts to formulate a syllogism as proof for his position, in the following way:] the colour and so on which are the object of dispute are destroyed by the destruction of the pot, because they are the colour and so on of the pot, like the colour and so on of a pot that is destroyed [e.g. by breaking],[17] [we reply:] No, because this [argument][18] would also fulfill its aim by proving that [the colour and so on that are under discussion] are destroyed by the destruction of another pot,[19]

16 All four qualities, colour, taste, smell and touch, are (or may be) *pākaja* in earth-substances, though it is colour which is invariably treated in detail, the others being reduced to a repeated 'and so on.'

17 Compare the similar syllogism given in Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyalīlāvatī*: *rūpaṃ cāśrayanāśād eva vinaśyati, kāryarūpatvāt, naṣṭaghaṭarūpavat* (831.3–4): cf. also footnote 19 below.

18 *asya* is to be taken as referring to the syllogism or reason put forward by the opponent as a proof, as is demonstrated by some of the places where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra uses similar expressions. Cf. e.g. *yathā hi gaganaṃ dīrghatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ, dravyatvād iti gagane mahattvasiddhiḥ, evaṃ gaganaṃ mahattvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyatvād iti dīrghatvasiddhiḥ | . . . dīrghatvādinārthāntaratānivṛttyarthaṃ dīrghatvātiriktādipadam | dīrghatvādisiddhyāpi* ***prakṛtānumāna****caritārthatvasya vaktuṃ śakyatvād iti* (GKṬ 60.5–13).

19 The point Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes to make becomes clear from a consideration of a related discussion in his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*. First the *Kiraṇāvalī* passage commented on: *tasmāt paramāṇuṣu pākād eva rūpādīnāṃ vināśotpattī, avayavini ca kāraṇaguṇebhya evotpādaḥ, āśrayavināśād eva vināśa iti param upapadyate | tad amī prayogāḥ—pārthivāvayavi*rūpādi āśrayavināśād eva vinaśyati, avayavirūpāditvāt, dagdhapaṭarūpādivat | tat kāraṇaguṇebhya evotpadyate, tata eva, tadvad eva |* (KĀ 120.8–11).
* *pārthivāvayavi°*: em., *pārthivāvayavava°* KĀ.
'Therefore it is most fitting that in [earth-]atoms colour and so on are destroyed and arise because of 'cooking' alone, and that in a compound [earth]substance [they] arise because of the qualities [colour and so on] of the [substance's] causes alone, [and] are destroyed because of destruction of the [substance's] locus alone. So [one can formulate] these syllogisms—the colour and so on of a compound earth substance is destroyed through destruction of [its] locus alone, because it is colour and so on of a compound substance, like the colour and so on of a cloth which has been burnt. [And] it (i.e. the colour and so on of a compound earth substance) arises from the qualities of [its] causes, because of just the same [*hetu*] (i.e. because it is colour and so on of a compound substance), and like just the same [example] (i.e. like the colour and so on of a cloth which has been burnt).'
On this passage, part of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary runs as follows. *'pārthivāvayavirūpādi' iti | pārthivāvayavirūparasagandhasparśā ity arthaḥ | āśrayavināśād evety evakāreṇa vahnisaṃyogo nivartyate | tenāpākanikṣiptakumbharūpam āśrayavināśavināśyaṃ vahnisaṃyogāvināśyaṃ ca, avayavirūpatvāt, pāṭitapaṭarūpavad iti prayogārthaḥ | evaṃ rasādīn api pakṣīkṛtya prayogā draṣṭavyā iti granthārthaḥ saṃmataḥ | kim atra yatkiṃcidāśrayavināśavināśyatvaṃ sādhyam utāpāka˚nikṣiptakumbharūpādyāśrayanāśavināśyatvam? nādyaḥ, yatkiṃcidāśrayavināśavināśyatve āpākanikṣiptakumbhavināśāsiddher arthāntaratvāc ca | nāpi dvitīyaḥ, āpākanikṣiptakumbhavināśavināśyatvasya kvacid apy aprasiddhatvād dṛṣṭāntasya sādhyavikalatvāc*

and because directly after [the pot] is drawn out of the kiln we recognize that it is the very same pot [which therefore cannot have been destroyed].[20]

ca | (GKṬ 28.17–29.2).
† *utāpāka°* : em., *uta pāka°* GKṬ
"'The colour and so on of a compound earth substance:" this means the colour, taste, smell
and touch of a compound earth substance. "Through destruction of [its] locus alone:" the
word "alone" excludes conjunction with fire [as a cause for destruction of the colour and so
on of the compound earth substance]. Therefore what the syllogism means is this (*tena. . . iti*
prayogārthaḥ): the colour of a pot placed in the kiln is destroyed by the destruction of [its] locus
and is not destroyed by conjunction with fire, because it is the colour of a compound substance,
like the colour of a torn cloth. And one should regard the [other] syllogisms [which are implied
by Udayana's syllogism] similarly, making the taste and so on [repectively] into the *pakṣa* (i.e.
reformulate as *āpākanikṣiptakumbharasa āśrayavināśavināśyo vahnisaṃyogāvināśyaś ca, ava-*
yavirasatvāt, dagdhānnarasavat or something similar): this is the generally accepted sense of
the passage. [But Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra raises an objection:] Do you here [in this syllogism] want to
prove that [the colour and so on of a compound earth-substance such as a pot placed in a kiln]
are destroyed by the destruction of any locus, or that they are destroyed by the destruction of
the locus of the colour and so on of the pot placed in the kiln? Not the first, because if [the
colour and so on of the pot placed in the kiln] is destroyed by the destruction of any locus it is
not proved that the pot placed in the kiln is destroyed, and because [the being destroyed by the
destruction of any locus would be] irrelevant. Nor the second, because nowhere has it been well
established that [the colour and so on] are destroyed by the destruction of the pot placed in the
kiln, and because the example does not possess the property to be proved.'
The *ghaṭāntaranāśanāśyatvasiddhi* of our passage corresponds to the first possibility in the GKṬ
discussion; the syllogism put forward by the opponent is not specific enough. As we have seen,
if the syllogism is formulated differently, so as to explicitly refer to the destruction of the pot
placed in the kiln, it may be attacked, as in the discussion of the second possibility in the GKṬ,
on the grounds that the example is not appropriate.
What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not however mention, in either passage, is what would most proba-
bly have been Udayana's response: if more specificity is required, the syllogism could be refor-
mulated with a reflexive pronoun: *pārthivāvayavirūpādi svāśrayavināśād eva vinaśyati, avaya-*
virūpāditvāt, dagdhapaṭarūpādivat.

20 The most striking thing here is that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra proves to be a *piṭharapākavādin*: he holds
that the *pākaja* qualities are produced directly in the *avayavin*, the pot (*piṭhara*). Below he ex-
plicitly rejects the Praśastapādan *pīlupākavāda*, according to which the pot is destroyed, broken
down into its atomic parts (*pīlu*), and it is these which acquire new qualities and then once more
compound to form a (different) pot. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is then the only author known to me who
holds this doctrine while professing to be a Vaiśeṣika. The *piṭharapākavāda* is normally as-
sociated with the Nyāya* and the *pīlupākavāda* with Vaiśeṣika; this has even frequently been
regarded as one of the chief distinctions between the two schools. Thus after briefly explaining
the Vaiśeṣika theory in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, Mādhava remarks *ittham pīlupākaprakriyā.*
piṭharapākaprakriyā tu naiyāyikadhīsammatā (89.16; among modern authors cf. Shastri 1976,
247 n.19, Türstig 1982, 36–37). This may be taken as another example of the quite surprising
diversity which can be found in the Vaiśeṣika, and which might prove far greater yet if more
literature of the school were available to us. It is to be noted that the sūtras themselves are not
sufficiently explicit on the point.
In his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*, be it noted, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra comments on the whole

> Because other qualities appear.[21] 7.1.6

If the old [colour and so on,] black and so on do not disappear through conjunction with fire, then the arising of [new colour and so on,] red and so on is not possible.

> By this [same principle] it is taught that [colour and so on] are impermanent even in eternal [substances]. 7.1.7

'By this' [that is to say] by the appearance of other colours and so on through conjunction with fire[22] the impermanence of the colour and so on of earth atoms too is to be established.

> [Colour and so on] are permanent in water, fire and wind, because the substances [they inhere in] are eternal. 7.1.8

The colour, taste and touch of water atoms, the colour and touch of fire atoms and the touch of wind atoms—these are not destroyed, because, in as much as the atoms [that they inhere in] are permanent, there is no destruction of [their] loci [to serve

faithfully on Udayana's exposition of the classical Vaiśeṣika theory, though as we saw in the previous note, he does at one place raise an objection. At the end, too, he makes a remark from which it may be gathered that he does not subscribe wholeheartedly to the theory he has been commenting on: *seyaṃ pākajotpattau ṛjumārgeṇa granthavyākhyā, tarkapramāṇacintā tu pratyekagranthagocarā paurvāparyānusandhātṛmanuṣyāṇāṃ na durlabhā* (GKṬ 40.15–17).
* The *piṭharapākavāda* was also held by at least some Mīmāṃsakas; cf. e.g. Udayana's remark (after refuting arguments against the *pīlupākavāda*) *tathāpi na naśyanty eva ghaṭādaya iti mīmāṃsakadurdurūḍhāḥ, te 'nukampanīyāḥ* (KĀ 122.3–4). Kumārila's position, however, is not (to me at least) unambiguously clear; the passage in the *Tantravārttika* ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 3.1.12 (see especially *nanu guṇāntarotpattikāle 'nyad eva dravyam iti na vyabhicaret | na tāvad ayam ekāntaḥ kāryadravyāntarodbhavaḥ | sthite 'pi hi bhavaty eva dravye kiṃcid guṇāntaram || yeṣāṃ tāvat kāryadravyāṇy eva ghaṭādīni pacyante paiṭharāṇāṃ tanmatenābheda eva | pailūkānām api tu paramāṇuṣu vyabhicāraḥ | yādṛśaṃ tv asmābhir dravyam abhihitaṃ tādṛśasya sarvatra guṇamātram eva bhidyate na svarūpam |* 45.13–18) seems to me, *pace* Jhā's translation (1983, 975–976), not to allow the matter to be settled. I do not know on what basis Mishra states that the Mīmāṃsakas 'appear to be perhaps the oldest propounders of the *Piṭharapākavāda*' (1987, 82 n. 65; no reference given).

21 With Jambūvijaya, I find it necessary to add this sūtra, 7.1.6 in Candrānanda's text, and found also in the Ahmedabad and Trivandrum manuscripts, though not in Śaṃkara Miśra's version of the sūtras. The following sentence allows itself most readily to be understood as a comment on this sūtra: note that there is no logical connection with the pr eceding sentences in the commentary on 7.1.5. Perhaps even more tellingly, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra takes *etena* in the following sūtra as meaning *agnisaṃyogād rūpāntarādiprādurbhāvena*, an interpretation which is quite natural if we assume he knew this sūtra but otherwise difficult to justify.

22 Like Thakur I find the compound *agnisaṃyogarūpāntarādiprādurbhāvena*, as in the MS, difficult to accept; however *agnisaṃyogād* for *agnisaṃyoga°* seems somewhat more natural than Thakur's *agnisaṃyogatas*.

as a] cause for the destruction of the colour and so on. If [it is objected] that conjunction [of the atoms of water, fire and wind] with fire is [a possible] cause of their destruction [just as in the case of earth atoms, we reply:] No, for even if [the atoms of water, fire and wind] have a thousand conjunctions with fire their former colour and so on do not change.

> In impermanent [water, fire and wind substances, colour and so on are] impermanent because of the impermanence of the substance [they inhere in]. 7.1.9

The colour and so on which exist[23] in impermanent water, fire and air [substances] are impermanent too, because of the existence of destruction of their locus [as a possible] cause of their [own] destruction.

> In earth [substances formed from parts], [colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities [colour and so on] of the cause(s). 7.1.10
>
> And produced by 'cooking' (i.e. conjunction with fire). 7.1.11

Earth is of two kinds: effect (i.e. substances formed from parts) and eternal (i.e. atoms). Of these, in earth which is an effect colour and so on are [also] effects, and they are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes [of the earth substance which is an effect]. For the colour, taste, smell and touch in an earth-dyad [are produced] from the colour, taste, smell and touch of the [two] earth atoms [which form the dyad], [the colour, taste, smell and touch] in an [earth-]triad [are produced] from those (i.e. the colour, taste, smell and touch of the three earth-dyads which form the triad), and [the colour, taste, smell and touch] in an aggregate of four [earth-triads] (*caturaṇuka*) [are produced] from those (i.e. the colour, taste, smell and touch of the four earth-triads), and so on, down to final substances. 'And produced by cooking,' because the colour and so on of a pot placed in the kiln and so on are determined by [empirical observation of] positive and negative concomitance to be produced by conjunction with fire, [and][24] since [one can make an] inference

23 The *vartamānarūpādayaḥ* of the MS, accepted by Thakur, must be wrong, for in Sanskrit of the kind we are dealing with this would be taken to mean 'the colour and so on which exist at present.' This cannot be intended here, and it is most unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra would express himself in this way if he did not mean this, so I assume a minor corruption, and read *vartamānā rūpādayaḥ* which is correct idiom; the *vartamāna* being used in the weak sense of 'to exist, to be.'

24 I take the two ablatives, *agnisaṃyogajatvāvadhāraṇāt* and *saṃyogajatvānumānāt*, as parallel, rather than subordinating one to the other. The first must refer to a conclusion drawn on the basis of empirical observation (note *avadhāraṇa* rather than *anumāna*): one notes that a new colour arises in pots placed in the kiln after they come into conjunction with fire, and that pots

of the fact that the colour and so on of earth atoms is produced by conjunction on grounds of [the fact that] while [these colours and so on are] impermanent[25] [and] not audible (i.e. not sound)[26] they are specific qualities (*viśeṣaguṇa*) of permanent [substances], like cognition and so on.[27] Therefore in some earth substances which are effects colour and so on are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes, and in some they are produced by 'cooking.' [But] in earth atoms [colour and so on] are only produced by 'cooking.'

However [in contrast with our explanation] Ātreya, Praśastapāda[28] and others

which are not placed in the kiln and do not have conjunction with fire do not change colour in this way (*anvaya* and *vyatireka*). The second ablative refers to an inference with little connection to empirical observation, based on certain other assumptions of the Vaiśeṣika. Though this inference might well be thought sophistical enough for a *navya*, it is in fact of some antiquity; cf. footnote 27 below.

25 This qualification is necessary to exclude permanent, unchanging qualities of permanent substances, such as the size of atoms.

26 Not being sound is explicitly stated as a *viśeṣaṇa* of the *hetu* because otherwise two of the three types of sound, viz. sound which arises from disjunction and sound which arises from sound, would be counter-examples. Compare the formulation of Vyomaśiva's very similar syllogism in footnote 27 below.

27 A close parallel to this syllogism is found already in Vyomaśiva's *Vyomavatī*. Neither edition has the text quite right, so I take the opportunity to present the correct form, which must be as follows: *pārthivaparamāṇurūpādayaḥ saṃyogajāḥ, vibhāgaja*[*]*śabdajaśabdānyatvānityatve sati nityaviśeṣaguṇatvāt,*[†] *sukhādivat*| *vibhāgajaśabdajaśabdena*[‡] *vyabhicāraparihārārthaṃ tadanyatve satīti* (Vyo^{1} 450.6–9, Vyo^{2} vol. 2 25.19–21, MS f. 114r19–21).
[*] *vibhāgaja°* : Vyo^{1}, *vibhāgajaga°*MS, *vibhāgajavibhāga°*Vyo^{2}.
[†] *nityaviśeṣaguṇatvāt*: MS Vyo^{1}, *nityasya viśeṣaguṇatvāt* Vyo^{2}
[‡] *vibhāgajaśabdajaśabdena*: MS, *vibhāgajaśabdaśabdena* Vyo^{1}, *vibhāgajavibhāgaśabdajaśabdena* Vyo^{2}.
The emendations of Shastri, the editor of Vyo^{2}, are certainly incorrect, because disjunction is not a *viśeṣaguṇa* of any substance and therefore does not need to be mentioned here, whereas sound which arises from disjunction does (cf. footnote 26 above). Note that Vyomaśiva's formulation of the inference is actually somewhat more precise than that of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as the latter's *aśrāvaṇatve sati* unnecessarily excludes *saṃyogajaśabda*, which does have both *hetu* and *sādhyadharma*.

28 This could be seen as implying that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra had access to a lost work of Praśastapāda, perhaps the *Ṭīkā* of which we hear in other sources (cf. Chemparathy 1968, 66-67; Bronkhorst 1993a, 148ff.), for in the PDhS we do not actually find a remark on how the sūtras 7.1.10 and 7.1.11 are precisely to be taken, nor is an explicit *prakriyā* of nine moments given—in fact, there is considerable discussion among the commentators as to how many distinct instants are required for the process as described by Praśastapāda. So if Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's remark is to be taken completely literally, this information is of no little interest for the history of the Vaiśeṣika.[*] On the other hand, if Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra knew the *Ṭīkā* he seems to have been the latest author, by some centuries, who did so, and I find it also conceivable that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may here mean by 'Praśastapāda', the PDhS as interpreted by its commentators. Still another possibility is that Ātreya, whose commentary on the VS Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra certainly must have used, attributed the following *prakriyā* rightly or wrongly to Praśastapāda.

explain the sūtra 'In earth [substances, colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities [colour and so on] of the cause(s)' (7.1.10) as expounding the fact that the colour and so on of earth substances which are effects are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of their causes, and [explain] the sūtra 'And produced by conjunction with fire'[29] (~7.1.11) as expounding the fact that the colour and so on of earth atoms are produced by 'cooking' (i.e. Ātreya, Praśastapāda and others apply 7.1.10 to compound earth substances alone and 7.1.11 to earth atoms alone). The process of formation (*prakriyā*) [of the new colour and so on as described by Ātreya etc. is as follows]:[30] in the first instant a movement [arises] in the atoms of

* Jambūvijaya, after quoting part of the passage we are dealing with, including the reference to Praśastapāda, continues *iti* ***mi. vṛttau*** [*pr. 65*] *praśastapādena ekaṃ sūtraṃ* [*7|1|10*] *dvidhā vibhajya vyākhyātam iti nirdeśo dṛśyate| praśastapādabhāṣye tu pākajotpattivicāre... ayaṃ abhiprāyo yady api lakṣyate tathāpi tatrāsya sūtrasyānirdeśāt praśastapādena sūtrāṇāṃ ṭīkāpi vyaracīti gamyate* (from the *prastāvanā* of his edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, p. 8 n. 5).

29 It is a little surprising that 7.1.11 here is quoted with a slight variation in reading. As far as sense is concerned, however, the variant makes no difference; we frequently find *pāka* explained as *agnisaṃyoga* or *vahnisaṃyoga*; cf. for instance, from the *Vyomavatī*, *pāko 'gnisaṃyogaḥ tasmāj jātaḥ pākajaḥ* (Vyo² vol. 2 20.11). I see no necessity to emend the text, and Thakur's *vahnisaṃyogāt pākajāś ceti* does not convince me.

30 The *prakriyā* given here, with relatively few details, is different from all others that I have seen, although the most commonly accepted ones are also of nine instants. These *prakriyās* and the subtle differences between them, are urgently in need of a critical study, which I cannot offer here. The absence, till now, of such a study may be due to the fact that many scholars subscribe to the view of Faddegon, who called the passage discussing this topic in the *Nyāyakandalī* one 'which for its absurdity is not worth translating' (1918, 412). For a descriptive survey of some different *prakriyās* found in various Nyāya ad Vaiśeṣika texts see Türstig 1982, 37–44. As comparative material, I shall quote here a similarly brief nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana, the text of which I give as edited by Jetly (the numbers also being his): *nodanādikramena dvyaṇukanāśaḥ* (1), *naṣṭe dvyaṇuke paramāṇāv agnisaṃyogāt śyāmādīnāṃ nivṛttiḥ* (2), *nivṛtteṣu śyāmādiṣu punar anyasmād agnisaṃyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ* (3), *utpanneṣu raktādiṣu —uttarasaṃyogāt pūrvakriyānivṛttiḥ* (4), *tato— 'dṛṣṭavadātmāṇusaṃyogāt paramāṇau dvyaṇukārambhanāya kriyā kriyayā pūrvadeśād vibhāgaḥ* (5), *vibhāgena ca pūrvadeśasaṃyoganāśaḥ* (6), *tannāśe paramāṇvantareṇa saṃyogotpattiḥ* (7), *saṃyuktābhyāṃ paramāṇubhyāṃ dvyaṇukārambhaḥ* (8), *ārabdhe dvyaṇuke kāraṇaguṇebhyaḥ kāryaguṇānāṃ rūpādīnām utpattiḥ* (9) *iti yathākramaṃ nava kṣaṇāḥ* (KĀ 122.15–22). The text between arrows is missing in Jetly's best manuscript, from Jaisalmer, and must be deleted, for if it is not, what is labeled by Jetly as the fifth instant would in fact require two instants; the *kriyā* and the *vibhāga* caused by it cannot of course occur in the same moment. In two other places I would propose adopting readings quoted from the same manuscript in Jetly's notes: *dravyārambhaṇāya* instead of *dvyaṇukārambhanāya* and °*saṃyoganivṛttis tasmin nivṛtte* for °*saṃyoganāśaḥ tannāśe*, though these changes do not significantly affect the sense. One more feature of the text is a little doubtful, the *ca* after *vibhāgena* in the instant marked 6, but here no variants are reported. The *prakriyā* then agrees in substance and almost exactly in wording with that given in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, which may well have been borrowed directly from the *Kiraṇāvalī*. I quote the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, adding my own numbering (that given in the *Kiraṇāvalī* quote above must be adjusted

the pot and so on which has been placed in the kiln, due to [their] being struck by fire [atoms] or due to being impelled [by the fire atoms], [and this motion is one] which produces a disjunction which is in opposition to the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad; in the second instant[31] the disjunction which is in opposition to the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad [is produced]; in the third instant the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad is destroyed; in the fourth instant the dyad is destroyed; in the fifth instant the [colour and so on] black and so on of the atoms is destroyed by conjunction with fire and a disjunction with ether and so on [arises], [which is] produced by disjunction [namely of the two atoms which formed the dyad] for the atom which has motion; in the sixth instant [the colour and so on] red and so on arise [in the atoms] through another conjunction with fire[32] and [simultaneously] the former conjunction of [each

to agree with it). *nodanādikrameṇa dvyaṇukanāśaḥ* (1), *naṣṭe dvyaṇuke paramāṇāv agnisaṃyogāc chyāmādīnāṃ nivṛttiḥ* (2). *nivṛtteṣu śyāmādiṣu punar anyasmād agnisaṃyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ* (3). *utpanneṣu raktādiṣu adṛṣṭavadātmasaṃyogāt paramāṇau dravyārambhaṇāya kriyā* (4). *tayā pūrvadeśād vibhāgaḥ* (5). *vibhāgena pūrvadeśasaṃyoganivṛttiḥ* (6). *tasmin nivṛtte paramāṇvantareṇa saṃyogotpattiḥ* (7). *saṃyuktābhyāṃ paramāṇubhyāṃ dvyaṇukārambhaḥ* (8). *ārabdhe dvyaṇuke kāraṇaguṇādibhyaḥ kāryaguṇādīnāṃ rūpādīnām utpattiḥ* (9) *iti yathākramaṃ nava kṣaṇāḥ* (89.8–15): here the only suspicious feature in the text seems to be the *ādi* after *kāraṇaguṇa* and *kāryaguṇa* in the ninth instant.

31 The manuscript varies between compounds such as *prathamakṣaṇe* and uncompounded forms such as *dvitīye kṣaṇe*. Thakur has chosen to print only compounds, and it is certainly possible that he is right and that the variation was introduced during transmission. But it is equally possible that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself varied his wording, whether unconsciously or for reasons of style, and the same inconsistency is found in the *pākajotpatti* section of his GKṬ (as printed), though admittedly not quite as flagrantly: we have e.g. *caturthe kṣaṇe* at 39.13 and *tṛtīyakṣaṇe* at 39.22. My policy has therefore been to follow the manuscript as far as possible: in cases where the precise form could not be established due to loss of the crucial letters (thus at instants four and six) I have been guided by the amount of space that would have been available—an *akṣara* with medial *e* (*pṛṣṭhamātra*) would take up markedly more space. In the case of the third instant, where the scribe has written *tṛtīkṣaṇe*, the choice seems even more of a toss-up, but it might be marginally more easy to skip over a *ya* than a *ye* with *pṛṣṭhamātra e* so I have followed the path of least resistence and read *tṛtīyakṣaṇe* with Thakur.

32 There is a small lacuna here, and I differ from Thakur as to how to restore it. His *ṣaṣṭha[kṣaṇe bhogyadṛṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇu]saṃyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ* must be wrong: although a conjunction between souls and the atoms which is dependant on the *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma* and *adharma*) of (future) 'users' (of the pot; cf. e.g. *bhoginām udakādyāharaṇadvāreṇa tatsādhyasukhaduḥkhādyanubhavabhāginām* KĀ 120.19–20) plays a role in Praśastapāda's account of the process, it is as a cause of the arising of motion in the atoms after the new colour and so on have arisen, not as a cause for the arising of the new colours themselves; cf. *tadanantaraṃ bhoginām adṛṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇusaṃyogād utpannapākajeṣv aṇuṣu karmotpattau teṣāṃ parasparasaṃyogād dvyaṇukādikrameṇa kāryadravyam utpadyate* (107.2–4). Perhaps Thakur misunderstood this passage, and took the ablative *ātmāṇusaṃyogād* with the immediately following absolute locative. That this is not possible is clear from the sentence which precedes the one just quoted in the PDhS, *tasmin vinaṣṭe svatantreṣu paramāṇuṣv agnisaṃyogād auṣṇyāpekṣāc*

individual] atom with *ākāśa* and so on ceases; in the seventh instant a conjunction [of the individual atoms] with another atom [arises], in the eighth instant a [new earth-]dyad arises; [and, finally,] in the ninth instant colour and so on[33] arises in the dyad in order preceded by the qualities of the causes (i.e. the atoms).[34] [All] this [, however,] is not correct, because there is no proof [that this entire process takes place as described] and because it has [already] been taught [ad 7.1.5; see p. 104] that [it] is contradicted by [our] recognition [of the fired pot as identical with the pot placed in the kiln].

> In water, fire and wind [colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of their causes. 7.1.12

In water and so on which are an effect, colour and so on are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes, for it is established by direct perception that the colour and so on of whole compound substances (*avayavins*) of water and so on are produced by the colour and so on of part substances of water and so on.

> [Colour and so on which are] produced by 'cooking' do not occur [in water, fire and wind].[35] 7.1.13

[In the form of a syllogism:] The colour and so on of effect-substances of water and so on are not produced by conjunction with fire, because they are colour and so on of water and so on, like the colour and so on of atoms of water and so on. [And] the colour and so on of atoms of water and so on are not produced by 'cooking,' because they are eternal, like ether.

chyāmādīnāṃ vināśaḥ punar anyasmād agnisaṃyogād auṣṇyāpekṣāt pākajā jāyante (106.23–107.2); cf. also e.g. the fourth instant in the nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana and in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, quoted in footnote 30 above. This immediately suggests a more plausible restoration for our text-passage. I read *ṣaṣṭhakṣaṇe 'nyasmād agnisaṃyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ*; the lost portion is not large enough for the scribe to have written *punar anyasmād*. That this is correct, and that *punar* may be safely omitted, is shown by parallels such as *tato 'nyasmād vahnisaṃyogāt paramāṇumātre raktādyutpattiḥ* (GKṬ 27.8–9).

33 One might well expect *raktādīnāṃ* here instead of *rūpādīnām*, but the latter is customary in this context; cf. e.g. the ninth instant in the nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana and in the *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*, quoted in footnote 30 above. The reason for this is perhaps that at this stage of the procedure the exact colour is of little importance; the pot is built up in the way that compound substances always are, with the effect taking on the colour of its causes.

34 The compound *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakakrameṇa* is difficult to translate literally. What is meant is 'in / with the usual order of formation of compound substances, whereby the qualities of the effect are caused by the qualities of the cause.' The word appears also to be used by Praśastapāda, though it is noteworthy that as far as I can see, there are always a number of variants such as *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakakrameṇa*, *kāraṇapūrvakrameṇa* and *kāraṇaguṇaprakrameṇa*; the word-index of the PDhS prepared by Bronkhorst and Ramseier (1994) may be used to find the relevant passages.

35 7.1.13 was first recognized as a sūtra by Jambūvijaya, followed in this by Nozawa.

Because [only] a substance without qualities [of a particular type can] produce[36] a qualities [of that type in its self],[37] motions and qualities do not have qualities. 7.1.14

For [only] a substance [can be] a *samavāyikāraṇam* of qualities. And quality and motion are not substance; hence qualities are not produced in them. Quality and motion do not possess qualities, because they are not substance. What[ever] possesses quality is a substance, for example a pot. In the case of [a cognition in the form] '[this] cloth is white,' however, the notion 'white' with regard to a substance is due to connection [of the substance, i.e the cloth] with the quality 'white,'[38] [and the notion of 'white'] with regard to a colour is due to connection [of the colour] with the universal 'whiteness', not because the colour possesses the quality 'white.' As for (*tu*) the notion 'a white [cow] goes'[39] in regard to a substance, it [arises] through connection [of the substance, i.e. the cow] with the quality 'white' and a motion, not because the motion possesses the quality white.

By this [the qualities which are] produced by 'cooking' are explained. 7.1.15

'By this' [means] by the expounding of the fact that [only] a substance can produce a quality [in its self].

And because [colour and so on] reside in one [single] substance. 7.1.16

36 In the sense of being its material cause. *ā-√rambh* is most frequently used with regard to the producing of new compound substances by part-substances, but already Praśastapāda also sometimes uses it in contexts of the arising of qualities or motions (cf. e.g. *guṇakarmāraṃbhe* PDhS 139.15).

37 With Jambūvijaya, I supply *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt* to the *karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ* which is all that the manuscript has here. The sūtra then agrees with Candrānanda's version (7.1.12). Thakur and Nozawa follow the manuscript. But the commentary on this sūtra already seems to presuppose the supplied words or something very similar: the use of the term *guṇārambha* is suggestive, and the commentary unusually prolix if Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra did not read the text in this form. Furthermore, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra glosses the *etena* of the following sūtra with *dravyasya guṇārambhapratipādanena*, with no further comment, which I find incredible if he did not have these words or a near equivalent in his *sūtrapāṭha*. Their presence is also attested by the Ahmedabad manuscript and the Trivandrum manuscript, though the latter has *guṇāntarārambhāt* in place of *guṇārambhāt*, and by a citation in the *Yuktidīpikā*, where, with a slight difference, we read *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhaḥ | karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ* (51.23); or should this be emended to agree with Candrānanda's reading? The entire sūtra is missing in Śaṃkara Miśra's version, as is also 7.1.15.

38 Here *guṇayoga* is to be taken in an ontological sense, as is shown by the following *śuklatvajātiyoga* and *śuklaguṇakarmayoga*. Differently in the commentary on 7.1.20; cf. footnote 49 on p. 114 below.

39 Cf. the progressive series (each successive term adding new information) *sad dravyaṃ pṛthivī viṣāṇī śuklo gaur gacchatīti* (PDhS 186.18–19).

The contradiction between black and red and so on must be removed either by a difference of place or a difference of time. And they have no difference of place, because they reside in one [single] substance. Therefore the contradiction is [to be] removed by a difference in time. [And] therefore the [colours] red and so on arise directly after the disappearance of black and so on or at [exactly] the [same] time as the disappearance of black and so on.[40]

> The perception and non-perception of an atom[41] and a large [substance] have been explained [in the fourth *adhyāya* and are] permanent.[42] 7.1.17

One must supply 'in the fourth *adhyāya*.' The non-perception of an atom and the

40 The *śyāmādivṛttisamavāye* of the manuscript can hardly be correct: *samavāya* is itself a *vṛtti*, a being-in-something, and is furthermore one, not many, (cf. so that it is odd, to say the least, to speak of 'the *samavāya* existing in black and so on.' Thakur's emendation *śyāmādivati samavāyena*, however, also seems incoherent, especially in view of the following *vā*. If we assume that the correct text is *śyāmādinivṛttisamaye*, on the other hand, the corruption can be easily explained as caused by haplography (two successive syllables with medial *i*) combined with the wrong expectation of *samavāya*—after all a word which occurs very frequently in a Vaiśeṣika text—in place of *samaya*. The *vā* now makes good sense. Another emendation which yields nearly the same sense would be *śyāmādinivṛttisamakālam* (*eva*), but the error is then a little harder to explain. Parallels for both idioms can be found in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary, e.g. *nanu dvyaṇukādivināśādibhyaḥ śyāmādi****nivṛttisamaya*** *eva paramāṇor ākāśādinā vibhāgaḥ* (GKṬ 38.4–5), *yadā dvyaṇukavināśottarakṣaṇe paramāṇudvayavibhāgena* ***śyāmādivināśasamakālaṃ*** *paramāṇoḥ pūrvākāśadeśavibhāgo janyate* (GKṬ 38.19–21). Unfortunately, our abridged text gives no further details on exactly how the change takes place according to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, but it is at least conceivable that he should say that the new qualities arise either in the moment after the destruction of the old ones or in exactly the same moment. The two possibilities reflect the problem of whether or not there is a brief moment during which the substance has no colour.

41 It seems better to translate *aṇu* as 'atom' here, rather than as 'an atomic substance,' for in the fourth *adhyāya* (cf. the following note) only atoms are referred to and not other substances of atomic size, and 4.1.6, quoted in the commentary below, would not apply to dyads.

42 While both Candrānanda (*nitya iti adhyāyanāma*, 53.22) and Śaṃkara Miśra (*nitya iti viṣayiṇaṃ nityatvapratipādakaṃ caturthādhyāyam upalakṣayati* 294.5–6) take *nitye* as a locative actually meaning 'in the fourth *adhyāya*,' Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's ***caturthādhyāya iti śeṣaḥ***, if the text is correct, seems to rule out that he so interpreted the word. Unfortunately there is no explicit commentary preserved, but I presume that he must have taken *nitye* as a predicate agreeing with the dual *upalabdhyanupalabdhī*. The intended sense might then be that the perception / nonperception of large substances / atoms has been taught (in the fourth *adhyāya*), and these are permanent, i.e. atoms are always imperceptible and large substances always (i.e. as long as they last, which is indeed forever in the case of the all-pervading substances, but not in the case of compound large substances) are perceptible (to those who are capable of perceiving them). The more natural interpretation, that they are taught *as being* permanent, is problematic, for the sūtras of the fourth *adhyāya* say nothing to that effect. Cf. also 7.1.25 and footnote 58 below.

perception of a large [substance have been explained].[43] For in the fourth [*adhyāya* we find] the two sūtras 'Perception with regard to a large [substance arises] because of [its] possessing many substances[44] [as *samavāyikāraṇas*] and because of [its] colour' (4.1.5) and 'Because it does not possess a substance [as *samavāyikāraṇa*] there is no perception with regard to an atom' (4.1.6).[45]

> [A substance is] large because of having many causes, because of the largeness of [its] causes and[/or] because of a particular kind of loose connection. 7.1.18

'Because of having many causes,' as in [the case of] a triad which is produced from three dyads which are not loosely connected; for this cause (i.e. the three dyads) is not large and there is no loose connection. 'Because the largeness of [its] causes,' as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of a pair of threads produced from two threads which are not loosely connected; for there the causes are not many and there is no loose connection. 'A particular kind of loose connection' [i.e.] a loose connection of the causes; [a substance may be large] because of this, as in [the case of] a substance which is an effect which is produced from two loosely connected tri-ads; for there the causes are not many and largeness of the causes, though existent, is not a cause [of the largeness of the effect].[46] [Sometimes these various possi-ble causes are combined; thus] largeness [arises] because of having many causes

43 The manuscript reading, *aṇor upalabdhiḥ mahato nupalabdhiḥ*, must clearly be wrong; perhaps it arose due to a scribe (unconsciously?) assuming that the two pairs of the sūtra must be taken *yathāsaṃkhya*.

44 The *anekadravyatvād* of the manuscript, followed by Thakur, has been emended to *anekadra-vyavattvād* because the latter reading is clearly presupposed by the commentary on 4.1.5. In the text of this sūtra as it occurs in the fourth *adhyāya* the manuscript reading is even more se-riously corrupt than here: the sūtra appears as *mahaty anekadravyārūpapaccopalabdhiḥ*, but Thakur's correction to *mahaty anekadravyavattvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ* is doubtless sound: the commentary contains the words *anekadravyam āśrayo yasya tad anekadravyam*[*] | *tadvattvāt*[†] *tadārabdhatvāt*| (44.9–10).
[*] *anekadravyam*: em. with Thakur (silently), *enekadravyam* MS.
[†] *tadvattvāt*: em. with Thakur (silently), *tadvattāt* MS.

45 4.1.6 is omitted in the manuscript at the relevant place in the fourth *adhyāya* but was rightly supplied by Thakur, chiefly on the strength of our passage here, as may be supposed. I dif-fer from Thakur only in emending the *adravyatvāt* of the manuscript to *adravyavattvāt*, which makes the sūtra more closely parallel to 4.1.5, and seems to me to be at least somewhat supported by the first sentence of what is to be taken as its commentary, *tatra paramāṇau dravyārabdhatvābhāvāc cakṣurādinā*[*]*nupalabdhiḥ* (44.15); cf. the commentary on 4.1.5 quoted in footnote 44 above.
[*] *cakṣurādinā°*: em. with Thakur (silently), *ca·cakṣurādinā°* MS.

46 This curious idea is already present, in essence, in Praśastapāda's PDhS; *pracayaś ca tūla-piṇḍayor vartamānaḥ piṇḍārambhakāvayavapraśithilasaṃyogān apekṣamāṇa itaretarapiṇḍā-vayavasaṃyogāpekṣo vā dvitūlake mahattvam ārabhate, na bahutvamahattvāni, samānasaṃ-khyāpalaparimāṇair ārabdhe 'tiśayadarśanāt* (131.10–15). In other words, the reason why in

and because of largeness [of the causes], as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of three threads which is produced from three threads which are of equal largeness and are not loosely connected. [And] largeness [may arise] because of having many causes and because of a loose connection, as for instance in [the case of] an effect-substance which is produced from three loosely connected triads. [And finally] largeness [may arise] because of having many causes, largeness of the causes and loose connection, as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of three threads which is produced from three loosely connected threads.[47]

> Atomic size is the opposite of that.[48] 7.1.19

[Atomic size is] 'the opposite' of 'that,' [i.e.] of largeness which is produced from having many causes, largeness of the causes [and/or] loose connection.

> [The designations] 'atomic' [and] 'large' [are applied to] that [substance] because of the existence of a special [, pronounced large size] and because of the absence of a special [, pronounced large size]. 7.1.20

With regard to 'that' [i.e., in the first case,] the well-known [example of an] *āmalaka* [fruit] and so on, one speaks of [it being] atomic through secondary usage[49] [of the term 'atomic' based on] the absence of a particularly pronounced largeness with reference to the size of a *bilva* [fruit],[50] [and, in the second case, with regard to]

the case of two balls of cotton which are combined to form a single one, largeness and number of the causes is thought not to cause the size of the product, is that the latter is larger than in the case of the size of a product formed from causes which are otherwise similar but lack *pracaya*, i.e. are more compact.

47 Due to an unfortunate eyeskip the last sentence of the commentary on this sūtra has been lost in Thakur's text, together with the following sūtra, 7.1.19, and the first two words of its commentary.

48 Despite the omission of this sūtra in Thakur's edition (cf. the previous note), Jambūvijaya rightly supplied it on the basis of the commentary (though this too was garbled in the edition) and Candrānanda's 7.1.17.

49 Here I take *guṇayoga* as 'secondary/metaphorical usage,' for, first of all, *mahattvaprakarṣābhāva* is not ontologically a quality, and secondly this agrees well with the usual Vaiśeṣika explanations: cf. e.g. *kuvalāmalakabilvādiṣu mahatsv api tatprakarṣabhāvābhāvam apekṣya bhākto 'ṇuvyavahāraḥ* (PDhS 130.25–131.1). Differently in the commentary on 7.1.14: cf. footnote 38 on p. 111 above.

50 It seems at least probable that a word has dropped out in the text, and that the construction should be parallel with the following one: in other words, since we are now dealing with *relative* largeness and smallness, it should be stated relative to what the *āmalaka* is small. And that the point of comparison is a *bilva* fruit may be assumed on the basis of the commentary to 7.1.21 (cf. page 115 below) and the existence of numerous parallels (e.g. that quoted from the PDhS in footnote 49 above).

the dyad, which is established by the *śāstra*,[51] one speaks of [it as] 'large' through secondary usage [of the word 'large' based on] a kind of 'excess'[52] with reference to the size of an atom.

[Next the *sūtrakāra*] teaches a [reason] refuting [the possibility that the designations 'atomic' and 'large' in cases such as referred to in 7.1.20 are used in] the primary sense—

Because [they occur at] the same time. 7.1.21

The removal of the contradiction between atomic and large [sizes must take place] through a difference of property-possessor or through a difference of time. In this case there is no difference of property-possessor, because the *bilva*, *āmalaka*, dyad and so on are one.[53] And there is no difference of time, 'because' the usages of [the designations] 'atomic' [and] 'large' [occur at] one time.

51 The conjecture *śāstrasiddhadvyaṇuke* is a hesitant proposal to solve one of the most difficult crux passages of this *adhyāya*. Let me first put the case for the conjecture. The following *paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaguṇayogāt*, which there seems to be no reason to suspect, implies that the object, in the locative, must be one which is referred to as large only metaphorically speaking, compared to an atom; in other words it must not be large in the literal sense. A dyad is then the only object which seems to plausibly fit this description: it possesses the sizes 'atomic' and 'short' as an atom does, and though it does not possess the peculiar (spherical) size of an atom, this does not mean that it is larger than one. Further, the mention of a *dvyaṇuka* in *bilvāmalakadvyaṇukāder ekatvāt* in the commentary to 7.1.22 only makes sense if *dvyaṇukas* had been mentioned before as an object to which a size is sometimes attributed which it has only metaphorically speaking. For the intended meaning cannot be that the dyads of a *bilva* and *āmalaka* are one, since that is not literally true, and if not meant literally is irrelevant to the problem under discussion there. If then a *dvyaṇuka* is the object we want, I conjecture that it may have been compounded with a qualification corresponding to *prasiddha* in the other example: while it obviously often happens in ordinary *vyavahāra* that one refers to something as small which is only relatively so, it can only be in rare cases, and probably among *śāstrins*, that dyads and atoms are spoken of, and their sizes compared. The *akṣaras ga* and *śa* are very similar in Malayalam script, so that it is not too far fetched to suppose the surviving *ga* to be a scribal error. Against this, it must in fairness be said that such an example as this then would be is not known to me from any other text, nor can I find a parallel, or a similar use of *śāstrasiddha* in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's other works. However, the *paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaguṇayogāt* (rather than *āmalakaparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaguṇayogāt*) already strongly suggests that we do have a unique example here, and Thakur's proposal neither fits the lacuna nor, I should say, yields adequate sense.

52 *utkarṣa* and *prakarṣa* are used interchangeably; the former term is not used by Praśastapāda, but is found regularly in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings, e.g. *pracayaviśiṣṭam avayavatritvaṃ tathāvidhamahattvotkarṣapratītiviṣaya ity api na| apracitair apy adhikair ārabdhe pracitatrayārabdhe tulyamahattvotkarṣapratīteḥ* (GKṬ 58.9–11).

53 As remarked in footnote 51 above, *bilvāmalakadvyaṇukāder ekatvāt* cannot mean 'because the dyad(s) and so on of a *bilva* and of an *āmalaka* are one;' that would be either false or irrelevant. What must be meant, therefore, is that the three things mentioned, *bilva*, *āmalaka* and dyad, are all things with regard to which one sometimes uses contradictory terms of size: the *āmalaka* may be called 'large' in the strict sense, but is also called 'atomic' (i.e. small, minute) in relation to

[One might ask:] How is there a contradiction between 'atomic' and 'large?' Therefore [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

> And[54] because of [an] example. 7.1.22

Since we observe [the sizes atomic and large] only with mutual exclusion [inasmuch as] what is atomic is not large, like an atom;[55] what is large is not atomic, like ether. [there is indeed] a contradiction, just as there is of cold and warm touch.

> That atomic size (*aṇutva*) and large size (*mahattva*) do not possess atomic size and large size is explained by motions and qualities (i.e. in the same way that motions and qualities are proved to be without motions and qualities).[56] 7.1.23

> Motions and qualities are [explained to be] without [the] qualities [of atomic and large size] by atomic and large size (i.e. in the same way that atomic size and large size are shown to be without the qualities of atomic and large size).[57] 7.1.24

[In the form of a syllogism, the point made by sūtra 7.1.24 is as follows:] Quality and motion do not possess atomic size and/or large size, because [they are] not substance, like atomic size and large size.

> By this perception and non-perception of long size (*dīrghatva*) and short size (*hrasvatva*) are explained as [being] permanent.[58] 7.1.25

the *bilva*. However, in all these cases it is one and the same the same *dharmin* which receives the two different designations, so the *virodhaparihāra* can not be by a difference in *dharmin*. As mentioned in the same footnote above, the occurrence of *dvyaṇuka* in this compound is one of the main points in support of the conjectural restoration of the commentary on 7.1.20.

54 The function of *ca* here is not made clear by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

55 The manuscript's *yathāṇuḥ* is clearly correct; the example is of an atom so that the masculine noun is required, not a neuter adjective. The choice for *aṇuḥ* rather than the more usual *paramāṇuḥ* is perfectly understandable, and could be described as a somewhat playful use of words. Thakur's *yathāṇu* may have originated in an error in the transcript.

56 No commentary on this sūtra has been preserved.

57 Thakur takes this sūtra as part of the commentary on the sūtra *aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ* (Śaṃkara Miśra's 7.1.16), which he conjecturally adds. Candrānanda and the Ahmedabad manuscript, however, read as we do here, and the reading of the Trivandrum manuscript, *aṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ karmmaguṇāt saguṇāḥ*, is most probably a corruption of the same text. Jambūvijaya and Nozawa have made the same decision. The reading of Śaṃkara Miśra's 7.1.16 is most probably secondary, as is suggested by the explicating *vyākhyātāḥ*, which is indeed to be supplied, in our text, by *anuvṛtti* from the preceding sūtra.

58 No commentary has been preserved on this sūtra, so unfortunately we have no confirmation for its reading and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's interpretation of it. All other versions read simply *etena*

Motions by motions. 7.1.26

Qualities by qualities. 7.1.27

One must supply 'are explained' [in 7.1.26 and 7.1.27]. Motions and qualities of long size and short size are explained [as non-existent] by motions as examples and qualities as examples. [In the form of a syllogism:] Long size and short size do not possess motions, and also do not possess [qualities such as] white and so on, because they are not substances, like motions and like [qualities such as] white and so on.

This is impermanent. 7.1.28

'This,' [i.e.] the four kinds of size which are produced,[59] is 'impermanent' [i.e.] is destroyed. [If one asks:] 'What is the cause for the destruction [of the quality size]?' to this too this same [sūtra forms the] reply—'this (i.e. the locus of size, substance) is impermanent.' The word 'this' refers to substance as the locus of the four kinds of size which are effects. And therefore [, since the sūtra is to be read twice in this way,] the four kinds of size which are effects are destroyed through destruction of their locus; this is the meaning of the sūtra.

parimaṇḍalam (i.e. the size of atoms) is permanent. 7.1.29

The size of atoms is 'permanent' [i.e.] is not destroyed. [If one asks:] 'How [is this possible]?' to this too this same [sūtra forms the] reply—'*parimaṇḍalam* (i.e. an atom) is permanent.' [Here, in this second reading of the sūtra] *parimaṇḍalam* is that which possesses *parimaṇḍalam* (i.e. the size of an atom) [in other words] an

dīrghatvahrasvatve vyākhyāte. and this is also the reading in which the sūtra is quoted by Śaṃkara in the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad 2.2.11. In commenting on the sūtra Candrānanda begins by remarking *upalabdhyanupalabdhī mahattvāṇutvavat*, so it is conceivable that under the influence of such explanations the reading we find here entered the sūtra-text in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's recension. On the other hand, there are at least two other possibilities which cannot be excluded. First, the / a scribe might have changed the text of the sūtra under influence, conscious or unconscious, of 7.1.17 (see p. 112 above and footnote 42). More plausibly perhaps, one wonders if text has not dropped out here in the manuscript due to eyeskip, and if the original text (of the abridged version) did not have something like *etena dīrghatvahrasvatve vyākhyāte* (7.1.25) | *etenāṇutvamahattvopalabdhyanupaladhinā dṛṣṭāntena* (or something similar) *dīrghatvahrasvatvayor upalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte*. I see no way to decide definitely between these three possibilities, and since, if the last alternative should be true, the exact wording of the commentary, especially the explanation of *etena*, is virtually impossible to recover, I have opted to let the manuscript reading stand, though not without grave misgivings.

59 *utpādyam*, excluding the size of atoms, souls, ether, space and time and the internal organ.

atom.[60] Therefore the size of atoms is permanent because there is no destruction of [its] locus [the atom; this is the meaning of the sūtra].

> False knowledge (*avidyā*) is the inferential mark of perfect knowledge (*vidyā*).[61] 7.1.30

'False knowledge' [here means] memory of concomitance, [and such an interpretation is justified] because memory is [a form of] false knowledge.[62] Perfect knowledge [here means] cognition of the being a property of the *pakṣa*.[63] One must supply the words 'of short size and atomic size.' [Thus the point made can be expressed in the form of a syllogism, as follows:] A dyad possesses a size in addition to that of atomic size [namely small size], because it is a substance, like a pot.[64]

60 According to this second reading of the sūtra, *parimaṇḍala* here means an atom. Such a meaning is not given in any lexicographical work—Indian or European—which I have been able to consult, but I have noticed a passage where Akalaṅka appears to use the word in such a sense: his *parimaṇḍalādeḥ* is explained by Prabhācandra as a bahuvrīhi compound with the words *parimaṇḍalaḥ* (masculine!) *paramāṇuḥ ādir yasya* (*Nyāyakumudacandra* 484.18–19). From the point of view of grammar, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's second interpretation can be justified on the strength of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.2.127, *arśaādibhyo 'c*, which teaches that the *taddhita* suffix *ac* may be applied in the sense of *matup* (from 5.2.94) to words in the *gaṇa* beginning with *arśas*. According to the almost unanimous grammatical tradition (the exceptions, according to the table on p. 10 of Birwé 1961, being Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's *Prakriyāsarvasva* and Rāmakṛṣṇa's *Gaṇapāṭha*) this is an *ākṛtigaṇa*; see e.g. the *Kāśikā* which comments *ākṛtigaṇaś cāyam / yatrābhinnarūpeṇa śabdena tadvato 'bhidhānaṃ tat sarvam iha draṣṭavyam*.

61 This is a particularly puzzling sūtra, and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is original and, to put it mildly, somewhat far-fetched.
Thakur's addition of *ca* seems only to have been based on the fact that Śaṃkara Miśra reads thus; since the addition was silent, Jambūvijaya and Nozawa naturally assumed that the word was in the manuscript and have left it in the text. Candrānanda has no *ca*, however, and neither has either of our *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts.

62 This is a striking contradiction of Praśastapāda, who classifies *smṛti* among the four types of *vidyā*, not under *avidyā*; *vidyāpi caturvidhā, pratyakṣalaiṅgikasmṛtyārṣalakṣaṇā*. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra follows the later, chiefly Nyāya, division of *buddhi* into *anubhava* and *smṛti*, of which we find mention in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary: *buddhistham āropyate, sā ca buddhiḥ kvacit smṛtiḥ kvacid anubhavaḥ* (GKṬ 95.24–25).

63 I can make no sense out of the manuscript reading *pakṣatvapratītiḥ* which is retained by Thakur. Such an expression would be highly abnormal: *pakṣatva* is not a *dharma* of objects which can be cognized or overlooked, rather one speaks of the making something into the *pakṣa* (e.g. *pakṣīkaraṇa*) for a particular inference. Furthermore, one expects, if the abridger and the manuscript tradition have not mangled the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary too much, that the *pakṣa* spoken of is that in the following inference, and not some other syllogism which is withheld from us. And in that inference, the reading and sense of which is confirmed by the existence of parallels (cf. footnote 64 below), the dyad is the *pakṣa*, and short size and atomic size are two *pakṣadharmas* which possess *vyāpti*.

64 The unspoken presupposition of this inference is that all substances have more than one size; they are either atomic and small or large and long. Compare the parallel syllogisms given by

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in the GKṬ. *yathā hi gaganaṃ dīrghatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyatvād iti gagane mahattvasiddhiḥ, evaṃ gaganaṃ mahattvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyatvād iti dīrghatvasiddhiḥ | yathā ca paramāṇur hrasvatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyatvād ghaṭavad iti paramāṇāv aṇutvasiddhiḥ, evaṃ paramāṇur aṇutvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇaṃ dravyatvād iti hrasvatvasiddhir api* (60.5-11).
In this, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra departs from the position of Praśastapāda, whose *dīrghatvahrasvatve cotpādyamahadaṇutvaikārthasamavete* (131.2–3) should doubtless be taken as implying that atoms and the all-pervading substances such as ether have only one size. The Praśastapādan viewpoint seems however to have been abandoned long before Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra by most Vaiśeṣikas: Vyomaśiva is the only commentator who takes the sentence just quoted at face value: *dīrghatvaṃ ca hrasvatvaṃ ceti dīrghatvahrasvatve | te tūtpādya*mahadaṇutvaikārthasamavete | utpādye ca te mahadaṇutve ca utpādyamahadaṇutve, tābhyāṃ sahaikasminn arthe samavete | tathā hi tryaṇukādāv utpādyaṃ mahattvaṃ tatraiva dīrghatvam | dvyaṇuke cāṇutvaṃ tatraiva hrasvatvam iti | paramāṇūnāṃ parimaṇḍalatvān na hrasvatvam, ākāśāder vyāpakatvāc ca na dīrghatvam, tadviparīteṣu tadvyavahāradarśanāt |* (Vyo^{1} 474.7–10, Vyo^{2} vol. 2 152.10–14, MS f. 129r1–3).
* *te tūtpādya°*: conj. Vyo^{2}, *hetūtpādya°* MS, *te cotpādya°* Vyo^{1}.
Śrīdhara mentions both positions but is not explicit in committing himself to one of them: *tatra paramāṇoḥ parimaṇḍalatvād dhrasvatvābhāvo vyāpakatvāc cākāśasya dīrghatvābhāva ity eke | anye tu paramāṇuparamamahadvyavahāravat paramahrasvaparamadīrghavyavahārasyāpi loke darśanāt paramāṇuṣu paramahrasvatvaṃ paramadīrghatvaṃ cākāśe ity āhuḥ | dīrghaparimāṇādhikaraṇam ākāśaṃ, mahatparimāṇāśrayatvāt, stambhādivat | evaṃ hrasvaparimāṇāśrayaḥ paramāṇuḥ, aṇuparimāṇāśrayatvāt, dvyaṇukavat |* (NK^{2} 333.10–14). The subcommentator Rājaśekharasūri explains *eke* in this passage as referring to Vyomaśiva—correctly no doubt—and *anye* as representing Śrīdhara's own view (*ity eke iti vyomaśivapādāḥ | anye tv iti granthakāramatam | ata evaitatsādhanāya prayogaḥ paramāṇuṣu paramadīrghatvaṃ cākāśa ity āhur iti |* NK^{2} 333.19–20). In this latter identification he is supported by the oldest of Śrīdhara's subcommentators, Naracandrasūri (d. A.D. 1231): *atha svamataṃ prakāśayati 'anye tu' iti* (NK^{2} 332.15), and this may indeed be correct, but it must be admitted that even so Śrīdhara has expressed himself cautiously. Udayana, however, makes his opinion explicit, and also attempts to read it into Praśastapāda's text, writing *ete nitye na sta iti kecit, tad asat | tathā hi mahattvaṃ prakṛṣyamāṇaṃ paramakāṣṭhāṃ prāpnoti | tathā dīrghatvam api prāpnuyāt | yathā cāṇutvam apakṛṣyamāṇaṃ paramāṇukāṣṭhāṃ prāpnoti tathā hrasvatvam api, upapatter ubhayatrāpi tulyatvāt | kathaṃ tarhi dīrghatvetyādiko granthaḥ* (i.e. the PDhS sentence quoted above) *| satyam, nityānityabhedena mahattvāṇutvavat pratyekaṃ dīrghatvahrasvatvayor dvaividhyaṃ suprasiddham ekadeśotkīrtanena smārayati dīrghatveti | tathā ca paramadīrghatvaparamahrasvatve paramamahattvaparamāṇutvaikārthasamavete iti smartavyam iti hṛdayam |* (KĀ 137.20–26). This is essentially Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's position, though his formulations are not particularly similar to those of Udayana. Instead he may have been influenced in wording by Vādivāgīśvara, who has *vivādādhyāsito* (scil. *paramāṇuḥ*) *'ṇuparimāṇavyatiriktaparimāṇāśrayaḥ, dravyatvāt | vivādādhyāsito* (scil. *ākāśādiḥ*) *mahatparimāṇavyatiriktaparimāṇāśrayaḥ, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavat paramāṇuvac ca* (*Mānamanohara* 63.3–5).
Finally, it should be perhaps mentioned here, in view of the position I ascribe to Praśastapāda, that the summary of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* by Potter is quite mistaken in its interpretation of another, related, passage. Potter writes that '[y]ogis are endowed with the ability to tell the minuteness of an atom from its shortness' (1977, 291), thus clearly implying that an atom has both. But the passage referred to in fact has *atha tryaṇukādiṣu vartamānayor mahattvadīrghatvayoḥ parasparataḥ ko viśeṣaḥ, dvyaṇukeṣu cāṇutvahrasvatvayor iti* (131.18–20), with

> Because of pervasion, ether is large, and so is the *ātman*. 7.1.31
>
> Because it does not possess that (i.e. pervasion), the internal organ (*manas*) is atomic. 7.1.32

'Pervasion' [is] the simultaneous conjunction with all substances which have form. The word 'and' [in 7.1.31] is meant to include long size and so on, which are not [explicitly] mentioned. 'The internal organ (*manas*) is atomic,' because, while not having pervasion, it is a permanent substance, like an atom of water.

> Space is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) qualities. 7.1.33

One must supply the words '[as] present everywhere and ultimately large.'[65]

> Time [is explained] by (i.e. in analogy with) the cause [, space, of notions of being further, nearer and so on, which time also can cause].[66] 7.1.34

Time is explained as present everywhere and ultimately large by (i.e. in analogy with) space [which like time is] the cause of notions of being further, nearer, earlier/eastern and so on.

Thus the first *āhnika* of the seventh *adhyāya*.

the latter question being answered *aṇutvahrasvatvayos tu parasparato viśeṣas taddarśināṃ pratyakṣa iti* (132.2–3). The fact that Praśastapāda asks the question with regard to dyads, not to atoms, is a clear and certain indication that the theory ascribed to him by Udayana and Potter is not in fact his.

65 In view of the *ca* and the parallel in the commentary to 7.1.34 the emendation *sarvagatā* for the *sarvagata°* of the manuscript, retained by Thakur, appears certain.

66 The interpretation apparently given of the sūtra seems somewhat odd, to say the least, but I do not think that the text is necessarily corrupt here.

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 2

> Because of [its] occurring separately from colour, taste, smell and touch, the number one[1] is a different object. 7.2.1

The number one is perceived in water and so on, even though there is no smell [therein], in fire and so on, even though there is no taste [therein], in the wind and so on, even though there is no colour [therein], [and] in ether and so on, even though there is no touch [therein]. Therefore it is different from colour and so on. In this way it should be proved that the number one is different from the other qualities and so on too.[2]

> In the same way separateness. 7.2.2

Just as the number one is different from colour and so on, so separateness of a single thing (*ekapṛthaktva*) too [is different from colour and so on]. And [in this way] the number one and separateness of a single thing are established [as separate qualities], and [by analogy] numbers greater than one (*anekatva*) and separateness of many things (*anekapṛthaktva*) [are similarly established as separate qualities].[3]

> Their permanence and non-permanence is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) the colour and touch of fire.[4] 7.2.3

1 It will be noticed that there is a certain ambiguity in the word *ekatva* and that the text appears to use it in somewhat different meanings. In the main I translate it as 'the number one,' but there are places where one must obviously understand it as 'one-ness,' i.e. the being one.

2 The reading of the manuscript, *guṇāntarādibhyo 'py ekatvasya bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ*, makes very good sense: the sūtra only explicitly mentions the first four qualities, but it is obviously important that the number one can also be shown to be distinct from the other qualities. Thakur's *guṇāntarādibhyaḥ anekatvasya bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ*, on the other hand, is puzzling: why would Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra only explicitly refer to the number one's differing from the first four qualities and to other numbers' differing from all the others?

3 The text is somewhat suspect here, I think, but the intended sense must have been something along these lines.

4 Due to an unfortunate eyeskip, originating no doubt in the transcript, part of this sūtra was omitted in Thakur's edition, and the remaining words were taken by him as belonging to the commentary on the previous sūtra. This was probably under the influence of Śaṃkara Miśra, who does not know the sūtra. The resulting syntax is however suspicious, *tayor nityatvānityatve* as an independent sentence being quite untypical of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style, and Jambūvijaya correctly concluded that the sūtra should be restored in agreement with Candrānanda's reading, which is incidentally also the reading we find in the two independent *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. Nozawa rejected this, and instead took *tayor nityatvānityatve tejaso rūpasparśau* to be Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's reading—one which would be anomalous, for obviously the sense is not that the permanence and impermanence of the number one and of separateness *are* the colour and touch of fire, but rather that they are analogous to those qualities. The manuscript confirms Jambūvijaya's proposal and allows us to see how the error occurred.

And [their] arising.[5] 7.2.4

Just as the colour and touch of fire[6] are permanent in atoms and in other [, i.e., compound, fire substances] are destroyed by the destruction of their locus, so the number one and separateness of a single thing [are permanent in atoms and in other loci are destroyed by the destruction of their locus]. And just as those (i.e. the colour and touch of fire) are, in an effect [substance], preceded by (i.e caused by) the qualities of the causes [of the effect-substance], so also the number one and separateness of a single thing [in an effect substance are preceded by (i.e caused by) the qualities of the causes of the effect substance].

> The absence of the number one and separateness of a single thing in the number one and separateness of a single thing is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) atomic and large size.[7] 7.2.5
>
> Motions by motions. 7.2.6
>
> Qualities by qualities. 7.2.7

The meaning of [these] sūtras has already been understood, because the method is the same.[8]

5 This sūtra was omitted in Thakur's edition owing to the same eyeskip which misled him with regard to the previous sūtra (see previous note). It was also not known to Śaṃkara Miśra; among other recensions, the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* also does not have it. Again, Jambūvijaya rightly conjectured that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra must have known it; again Nozawa rejected this conjecture; and again the manuscript shows Jambūvijaya to have been in the right.

6 Neither Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra nor any other ancient or modern authority appears to address the question why it is fire that is specifically mentioned here. It is of course clear that earth would not do, because it is a special case in that its qualities can be *pākaja* (cf. VS 7.1.5–7, 7.1.10–11 and 7.1.14–16 with commentary), and air would also be an unsuitable point of comparison, as it has no colour and is, in the Vaiśeṣika view, imperceptible despite possessing perceptible touch (cf. VS 4.1.7 = Candrānanda's 4.1.8). I see no particular reason, however, why water, which precedes fire in the standard order of substances, would not do equally well.

7 The manuscript reads *'ṇumahattvābhyāṃ*, which is of course not impossible, and is retained by Thakur and, following him, Nozawa, although the other recensions (with the exception of the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript which omits the sūtra) have *'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ* here. But in 7.1.23, 7.1.24 and 7.2.14—the last being a particularly exact parallel to our sūtra here—all recensions transmit the compound *aṇutvamahattva*, and inconsistency on this point seems very improbable to me. Therefore, like Jambūvijaya, I assume that the *tva* has been lost in transmission; this is only the first of a series of omissions of *akṣara*s and words which plagues the following section. The scribe was perhaps tired, and had several lapses of concentration. Note that in the commentary on 7.2.10 and in that on 7.2.11 the sense twice forces us to assume the same type of omission, that of a *tva* suffix within a compound (cf. footnotes 20 and 22 below).

8 I.e. 7.2.6 and 7.2.7 are to be interpreted in analogy with the interpretation given at their earlier occcurrence, as 7.1.26 and 7.1.27. 7.2.5 has not appeared before, but is parallel to 7.1.25 so that it is true that there is virtually nothing new to explain here.

> Because motions and qualities do not have numbers, one-ness of everything does not exist. 7.2.8

The Illusionist-Vedāntins[9] say that everything, quality, motion and so on,[10] is one. That is not [correct], because one-ness of everything is contradicted. [In proof one may formulate a syllogism as follows:] Quality, motion and so on are devoid of the number one,[11] because they are not substance, [and] what is not thus is not thus,[12] like a pot.[13]

> Since 'one' does not exist,[14] [even] a metaphorical [one-ness] does not exist. 7.2.9

9 The expression *māyāvedāntin*, referring to proponents of Advaita Vedānta, is not one which I have met with in the works of other authors, nor does it appear to have been registered in any lexicographical work I have been able to consult. The sense is however perfectly clear, and the wording is confirmed by a reference to the *māyāvedāntasiddhānta* in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's full VS commentary (TS 67.14). Elsewhere Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra uses the more familiar *māyāvādin* (GKṬ 97.15 and 98.2).

10 Thakur's restoration of the lacuna has been rejected because there is clearly room for two or three more *akṣaras*. Another possibility might be *dravyaguṇakarmādikaṃ*, but *sarvaṃ guṇakarmādikaṃ* seems to fit better with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's following refutation.

11 As the reader no doubt has already noticed, it is with a rather under-hand trick, hinging on the ambiguity of *ekatva*, that the monist position is here refuted. It must be said in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's defence that the wording of the sūtra itself suggests that some play on *ekatva* is going on. However it is perhaps not necessary to see the monists as the target of criticism here: Candrānanda does not seem to make such an association, introducing the sūtra with *nanu sarveṣām eva padārthānām ekatvam, sadaviśeṣāt* (58.1), nor does Śaṃkara Miśra do so.

12 I.e. that which *is* substance is not devoid of the number one.
There is a small problem in the precise wording of this syllogism. It is of course an inference of the *kevalavyatirekin* type, i.e., the *hetu* (here *adravyatva*) occurs nowhere but in the *pakṣa* (here all the categories except for substance). Such syllogisms are employed dozens of times in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings (e.g. at GKṬ 31.9–10 or TS 66.13–14), and, as far as I can see, if a full syllogism is given it invariably employs the formula *na yad evaṃ na tad evam*. Now here, though the manuscript does not preserve the passage completely, what the scribe wrote was almost certainly *yan naivaṃ na tad evam*, a form which I do not find used elsewhere by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and cannot at present attest in the writings of other authors. Should we accept this variation of formula as authorial, or is it due to the abridger or a scribe?
Out of three possible practical decisions here, Thakur (or perhaps the transcriber) seems to me to have chosen the worst, altering the text to *yan naivaṃ tan naivaṃ*—a form found neither in the manuscript nor anywhere in the corpus of our author's works. Of the other two, letting the text stand as transmitted or emending to agree with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's usage elsewhere, I have chosen for the latter. It seems to me that the *usus auctori* is well established on this point, and while I think that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does sometimes deliberately vary his mode of expression, he is unlikely to do so in a 'formal' (or formular) syllogism.

13 The example too has been lost in the manuscript, but there is space for one, and since a substance is required, I follow Thakur in supplying *ghaṭavat*, the usual favourite. Of course it is possible that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra here used the second favourite, *paṭavat*, instead.

14 The commentary clearly supports the transmitted *ekasyābhāvād*. Note however that Candrā-

7.2.10

Effect and cause can not have the number one and separateness, because it is not possible that the number one[20] should reside in effect and cause which are not one, and because, as a quality, it is not possible that [the number one] should reside in a quality [and many effects and causes are qualities], and because it is also not possible that separateness, as a quality [too], should reside in quality and so on.[21] By this difference and non-difference of universal and individual manifestation is also refuted.

> This (i.e. numbers greater than one and multiple-separateness) is explained [as occurring in] two impermanent [substances]. 7.2.11

Numbers greater than one[22] and multiple-separateness existing in two impermanent [substances] are explained, [that is to say, it is explained] that (*iti*) [they] are destroyed through destruction of their locus.[23]

> Conjunction [is of three kinds:] arising from motion of either of the two [substances which have conjunction], arising from motion of both [substances] and arising from conjunction. 7.2.12

[Conjunction] which arises from motion of either of the two [substances is that of a substance with form but] without motion with [a substance] which has motion, such

neuter singular.

20 The sense clearly requires *ekatvasya* here, not *ekasya* as is transmitted by the manuscript, which Thakur follows in this. The same type of error was apparently made by the scribe in 7.2.5 and in the commentary on 7.2.11; see footnotes 7 and 22.

21 A substantial part of the argumentation here was missing in Thakur's text, having been probably omitted in the transcript as a result of eyeskip between two occurrences of °*papatteḥ*.

22 Yet again the scribe must have omitted the abstract *tva* here (cf. footnotes 7 and 20 above); this time Thakur made the necessary correction.

23 It seems fairly clear how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands the sūtra; *anekatvam anekapṛthaktvaṃ ca* must correspond to *etat*, and since *āśrayanāśān naśyatīti* is clearly meant as an explication of *vyākhyātam*, the *vartamānam* should not be taken with *vyākhyātam* but must be intended to make clear how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands the locative *anityayoḥ*. Candrānanda, however, reads and interprets the sūtra altogether differently. His reading is *etad anityanityayor vyākhyātam*, and on this he comments *etat pūrvasūtram anityaviṣayam api nityeṣv ākāśādiṣu yathāsambhavaṃ vyākhyātaṃ boddhavyam| tathā hi—śabdākāśayoḥ kāryakāraṇayor naikatvaṃ nāpi pṛthaktvam* (58.13–14). Candrānanda is alone in reading the sūtra in this way, both independent *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts supporting Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's reading, which is also followed by Śaṃkara Miśra. The latter, however, has yet another interpretation, the direction of which may be seen from the opening of his commentary on the sūtra: *anityayoḥ saṃkhyāpṛthaktvayoḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakatvaṃ yad vyākhyātaṃ tad anityayor ekatvaikapṛthaktvayor eva boddhavyam* (318.3–4).

as of a post with a falcon,[24] and of all-pervading [substances] with [substances] which have form.[25] [Conjunction] which arises from motion of both [substances is that of two substances] with opposing motion, such as of two wrestlers or of two rams;[26] for [in these cases] the motions of both substances are causes of the conjunction as no difference [as to their motion] is perceived in them. And [conjunction] which arises from conjunction[27] is twofold—[conjunction] which arises from the conjunction of the [material] causes [of the conjunction] and that which arises from the conjunction of a [material] cause and something which is not a [material] cause [of the new conjunction].[28] The first is, for example, [when] from the motion of a thread a conjunction with another thread arises, from which a conjunction [arises in the first thread] with the [particular part of] ether and so on which is conjoined with the other thread. [This type sometimes also arises]

24 The standard example, given also by Praśastapāda (cf. the following note) and e.g. Candrānanda on this sūtra (7.2.10 in the recension he follows).

25 The sentence *anyatarakarmajaḥ kriyāvatā niṣkriyasya, yathā sthāṇoḥ śyenena. vibhūnāṃ ca mūrtaiḥ* is, though not indicated as such, a quotation from the PDhS where it is preceded by a partitive *tatra* (139.19–21).

26 This is almost identical with another sentence in the PDhS, where *ubhayakarmajo viruddhakriyayoḥ* is however followed by the additional word *saṃnipātaḥ* (139.21–22). The examples are again standard, oft repeated ones.

27 Obviously the *saṃyogaś ca* of the manuscript is wrong, but I have preferred a more economical emendation than Thakur, who added *saṃyogajo*. This renders the *saṃyogaś (ca)* redundant and anomalous, while the word-order also strikes me as a little suspicious. Nor does such a reading explain the error any more easily, as it cannot be attributed to either a homoeoteleuton or a homoeoarcton (which would result in simply *saṃyogajo*). Instead, I believe that the scribe skipped over a single syllable, through no particular graphical cause, as he clearly did in several places in this particular section of the manuscript. Exactly the same mistake was made in the text of the sūtra itself, where the scribe wrote *ubhayakarmmas* for *ubhayakarmajas*, and again later in this same sentence, where he wrote *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaś ca* for *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogajaś ca*: in both cases Thakur makes the necessary emendation.

28 In contrast to the preceding two kinds of conjunction, in explaining which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra remained (even verbally) faithful to Praśastapāda's account in the PDhS, we find in this two-fold division of *saṃyogajasaṃyoga* an idea which may be original to our author. In the PDhS, *saṃyogajasaṃyoga* is taught to be a *kāraṇākaraṇasaṃyogapūrvakaḥ kāryākāryagataḥ saṃyogaḥ* (140.1–2), and from the examples given it is sufficiently clear that with *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogapūrvakaḥ* Praśastapāda indeed means 'caused by conjunction between causes and non-causes.' This therefore appears to correspond to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's second type. The only division of *saṃyogajasaṃyoga* mentioned by Praśastapāda is according to whether it arises from a single conjunction, two or many (PDhS 140.2–6).
The motivation for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's innovation (if it is indeed his), must have been the desire to make conjunction even more parallel in its classification with disjunction, in the case of which all writers admit a similar sub-division of *vibhāgajavibhāga* (cf. the commentary on 7.2.13 below). The idea does not however seem to be free of problems (see the following footnote), and it does not surprise me much that I have been able to find no trace of it so far in the writings of later authors.

from two [conjunctions of causes], for example, the conjunction of a substance consisting of two threads with ether which [arises] from the two conjunctions of [the individual] threads with ether.[29] The second [type of conjunction arising from conjunction], on the other hand, is for example the conjunction of the body with a wall [which arises] from the conjunction of the hand with the wall.

'And' [in this way] conjunction is of three kinds—[here, in the sūtra,] the word 'and' is used in the sense of restriction (i.e. it indicates that there are exactly three kinds of conjunction and no more).

If [an opponent claims that there is] an unproduced (i.e. eternal) conjunction of all-pervading substances [which is a] fourth [kind of conjunction, we reply]:[30] No,

29 The examples Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra gives here are puzzling, and raise the problem of what he means by the distinction he makes. In the first case, the conjunction which functions as the cause is between two threads, A and B, of which it is A that has moved towards B, so that this is a conjunction of the *anyatarakarmaja* variety. The conjunction which is said to arise from this is a conjunction of A with the all-pervading substances which are conjoined with B, i.e. with the part of those substances which occupies the same space as B. Now A is the material cause of the new conjunction, but B is not a material cause either of A or of A's new conjunction, so the latter would normally (i.e. in Praśastapādan terminology) be considered one which is *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaja*. In the second case the two conjunctions of threads A and B with ether (and so on) cause the conjunction of the larger compound substance AB with ether. Here neither A nor B is a (material) cause of AB's conjunction, but they are of AB itself. But the cause-conjunctions are both with ether, and in each case with a part of ether which is not equivalent to the part of ether that is one of the loci of the conjunction that they produce, so this seems even less strictly *kāraṇasaṃyogaja*. In fact it is not clear to me how this second example differs from the following example of *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaja saṃyoga*.

30 The notion of an unproduced, eternal, conjunction (*aja saṃyoga*) of eternal substances is already mentioned and rejected by Praśastapāda in the PDhS, in a discussion beginning with the *vārttika*-style sentence *nāsty ajaḥ saṃyogo nityaparimaṇḍalavat pṛthag anabhidhānāt* (140.19–20). Praśastapāda goes on to say that the conjunction of atoms with the all-pervading substances such as ether is in fact only located at a particular part of the all-pervading substance concerned and is of the *anyatarakarmaja* type (the motion being of course that of the atoms, for ether and so on cannot move): *paramāṇubhir ākāśādīnāṃ pradeśavṛttir anyatarakarmajaḥ saṃyogaḥ* (141.3–4). And nor is there an unproduced mutual conjunction of the all-pervading substances; they are not conjoined at all, and the reason given for this is that they lack *yutasiddhi* (on which cf. 7.2.17 and the commentary thereon below).

Though Frauwallner comments on the philosophical importance of the rejection of *aja saṃyoga* (1956, 224–25), neither he nor Praśastapāda himself nor his commentators gives any clue as to the identity of the thinkers who proposed the existence of this fourth type of conjunction. Bhāsarvajña clearly refers to Praśastapāda's rejection of this type of conjunction and offers a defence, writing *yutasiddhyabhāvān nāsti vibhūnāṃ saṃyoga ity ayuktam, hetor asiddhatvāt | pramāṇasiddhaś ca vibhūnāṃ saṃyogaḥ | tathā hi—ākāśena saṃyukta ātmā, śarīrasaṃyuktatvāt, bhūtalavat* (NBhū 170.13–15). Mishra (1987, 47–48) is thus not unjustified in listing the difference of opinion with regard to *aja saṃyoga* as one of the points distinguishing Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, though I am not sure that all Naiyāyikas would be unanimous on the subject, and the only text passages he refers to (from the *Vyomavatī* and the *Nyāyakandalī* on this PDhS passage) do not really suffice to demonstrate his point. He does not however mention that argu-

for there is no proof [for the existence of this type of conjunction]. If [the opponent adduces as proof the syllogism:] two all-pervading substances are mutually conjoined, because they are substances, like a pot, [we reply]: No, for the [logical ground in this syllogism] deviates with regard to threads and a cloth and so on.[31] If [the opponent tries to improve his syllogism by saying that] it is to be further qualified by [adding] 'when there is no relationship of produced and producer' [we reply]: No, for [the logical ground still] deviates with regard to the Himalaya and the Vindhya [mountain ranges] and so on, in which [mutual] conjunction has not [ever] arisen,[32] and[33] with regard to a cloth and so on which has been destroyed.[34]

> By (i.e. in analogy with) this (i.e. conjunction) disjunction is explained. 7.2.13

Like conjunction, disjunction too [is of three kinds]: disjunction[35] which arises from motion of either of the two [substances, [that] which arises from motion

ments for this fourth type of conjunction are also to be found in some Mīmāṃsā works: thus the *Nyāyaratnamālā* of the great Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsaka writer Pārthasārathi Miśra gives the following: *tathāpy ajaḥ saṃyogo vibhunor bhaviṣyaty anumānāt—vibhunī dravye mithaḥ saṃyukte, dravyatve sati nirantaratvāt, ghaṭākāśavad iti* (327.18–20: the context is a discussion about the type of contact involved in the perception of sound). Similarly the (also Bhāṭṭa) *Mānameyodaya* first divides conjunction into permanent and non-permanent (*nitya* and *anitya*) and then further subdivides the latter into the three types accepted by the Vaiśeṣika: the permanent type, which is taught to be the mutual conjunction of permanent and all-pervading substances such as ether and time, corresponds of course to the *aja saṃyoga* of the earlier writers (see *Mānameyodaya* 250.8–251.6).

The Prābhākaras seem however to differ from the Bhāṭṭas on this point: at least the only explicit statement I have noticed, in Jaipuri Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's commentary *Nyāyasiddhi* on the *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, briefly describes conjunction in words almost identical with those of Praśastapāda as *aprāptayoḥ prāptiḥ saṃyogaḥ | so 'nyatarakarmajaḥ ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ceti trividhaḥ* (158.1–2).

31 The threads are related to the cloth formed out of them by *samavāya*, the cloth inhering in the threads, and not by conjunction.

32 The economical emendation of *adutpannasaṃyoge* to *anutpannasaṃyoge* appears to me to yield acceptable sense. I do not quite understand Thakur's *utpannasaṃyoge*: presumably he means this to go with *naṣṭapaṭādau*.

33 Conjecturing loss of a *ca* due to yet another *lapsus oculi*: clearly two examples are given.

34 What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra says here is that even if the opponent reformulates the syllogism intended to prove the existence of an unproduced conjunction of all-pervading substances in the following way—*vibhū mithaḥ saṃyujyete, ārabhyārambhakabhāvavirahe sati dravyatvāt, ghaṭavat*, the inference remains invalid, for there exist cases where the *hetu* is present without the *sādhyadharma* also being present. One such is that of the Himālaya and the Vindhya mountain ranges: both are substances, and they are not related as producer and produced (as the thread and cloth are), yet they never have been and never will be conjoined. Another counter-example is a cloth which has already been destroyed: there are infinite substances which are not related to it as producer and produced but which will never have been conjoined with it.

35 The final *vibhāgaḥ* in the manuscript is somewhat redundant. Nonetheless I retain it, unlike Tha-

of both [substances] and [that] which arises from disjunction. The first is for example[36] [that] of a post with a falcon. The second is for example [that] of two wrestlers. [And there is disjunction which arises] from disjunction of the causes alone, such as the disjunction of a section of bamboo[37] from ether and so on [which arises] from the disjunction of [two] bamboo sections,[38] [and finally] there is disjunction which arises from disjunction of a cause and a non-cause, such as the disjunction of a body and a wall [which arises] from the disjunction of a finger from the wall and [the resulting] disjunction of a hand from the wall: this [is the meaning of the sūtra] (*iti*).

> The absence of conjunction and disjunction in conjunction and disjunction is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) atomic size and large size. 7.2.14
>
> Motions by motions. 7.2.15
>
> Qualities by qualities. 7.2.16

The meaning of these three sūtras has already been understood.[39]

> Because [they] are not established as connected, conjunction and disjunction of effect and cause do not exist. 7.2.17

'Establishing as connected' (*yutasiddhi*) is the establishing that two things are connected, [i.e.] in conjunction; [in other words] the cognizing that two things are in conjunction.[40] Because this is not present, there are no conjunctions between that

kur, judging it to be possibly authorial. Its function, if one can speak of one, is to increase the parallelism with the wording of 7.2.12. It can not be ruled out that it is scribal, but the increased carelessness of the scribe in this part of the text seems to manifest itself mostly in omission of *akṣara*s and words, rather than their addition. Nor can such an addition be explained as dittography. It does remain possible, of course, that the word was added by a scribe at some earlier point in the transmission of the text.

36 It seems most unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should have omitted the *yathā* in this case, so I assume yet another careless slip by the scribe here.

37 'Bamboo' may not be botanically accurate, but the important thing is that *vaṃśa* is some bamboo- or cane-like plant with a hard stalk, and *dala* not so much a leaf as a section of the stalk (it is sometimes paraphrased by *parva*). These occur in a standard example for *vibhāgaja śabda*, see for instance Uddyotakara's *vaṃśadalavibhāgānugṛhītād vaṃśadalākāśavibhāgāc chabda iti* (NV 199.22–23).

38 Essentially the same example is given by Vallabhācārya in the *Nyāyalīlāvatī*: *sphuṭadveṇuśabdāc ca vibhāgo 'vagamyate* | … *sa ca vibhāgajaḥ, yathā vaṃśadalapāṭanānantaraṃ kriyayā vaṃśadalayor vibhāgaḥ, tataś ca nabhobhāgavibhāgaḥ* (851.3–852.1).

39 See footnote 8 on p. 122 above.

40 This definition is completely different from that given by Praśastapāda: *sā* (i.e. *yutasiddhi*) *punar dvayor anyatarasya vā pṛthaggatimattvaṃ yutāśrayasamavāyitvaṃ ceti* (PDhS 141.6–7).

which is produced and that which produces it. If [it is objected that] there is [at least] a cognition of a connection [between that which is produced and that which produces it], [we reply:] Then let there be a connection, but this [connection] is inherence [and not conjunction]. [To put it in the form of a syllogism:] This cloth is not conjoined with this thread, because it is produced by it (i.e. the thread), like the colour of a thread. And since there is no conjunction, there is [also] no disjunction which would destroy the [conjunction].

And because [they] are qualities. 7.2.18

The colour and so on of the cloth do not possess conjunction and disjunction,[41] because they are qualities, like conjunction.

[Someone may object:] 'But there is a connection between what is expressed and [the word] that expresses it.' Therefore [the sūtrakāra] says—

[A word which expresses something] is also spoken with reference to a quality. 7.2.19

Not only is the [word] which expresses something a quality, it is also spoken with reference to a quality, [i.e.] used by convention with regard to white and so on. Therefore since both what is expressed and [the word] which expresses it are qualities, they cannot possess conjunction and disjunction.

[And also] neither of them possesses going,[42]

At a later place Praśastapāda repeats the definition and clarifies it slightly: *sā punar dvayor anyatarasya vā pṛthaggatimattvam | iyaṃ tu nityānām | anityānāṃ tu yuteṣv āśrayeṣu samavāyo yutasiddhir iti* (PDhS 152.10–12). Candrānanda is very close to Praśastapāda in the wording of his definition; on the same sūtra we are now dealing with, numbered 7.2.14 in his text, he writes *yutasiddhir dvayor anyatarasya vā pṛthaggatimattvam | sā ca nityayoḥ, yutāśrayasamavetatvaṃ cānityayor yathā ghaṭapaṭayos tvagindriyapārthivaśarīrayoś ca* (59.7–8). In short, while Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra clearly takes *yuta* as derived from (1) √yu 'to unite,' the others understand it as derived from (2) √yu 'to separate' (cf. e.g. Whitney 1885, 131–132).

41 Thakur corrects the *paṭarūpādayogavibhāgavantaḥ* of the manuscript to *paṭarūpādayo na vibhāgavantaḥ*, but I see no reason why *vibhāga* should be singled out here. The sūtra continues the discussion begun in 7.2.17, in which both *saṃyoga* and *vibhāga* are mentioned, and in the commentary on the following sūtra, 7.2.19, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra continues to treat both qualities as the subject of the argument. If anything, *saṃyoga* is the more crucial quality, in the light of the subsequent discussion of the connection between word and object. I therefore suspect that we have another scribal carelessness here, caused this time by eyeskip between two occurrences of a *yo*.

42 The conjecture *ubhayor gamanaṃ nāsti* is the best I can do here, and it is not unlikely to be correct, although there may be other possibilities. Thakur's *ubhayor gatyabhāvāt* fits ill as an *avataraṇa* to 7.2.20: it is only rendered coherent in the text he presents by his (causeless, as far as I can see) transposition of 7.2.20 to follow directly on 7.2.19. Not only is there no justification for this in the manuscript, it is intrinsically somewhat improbable. Admittedly Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra frequently groups sūtras together, but not without there being better reason for this than I think we have here.

Because they do not possess motion. 7.2.20

[For] first of all a word such as 'Himālaya' [when] uttered in the Deccan does not go up to the Himālaya. Nor does the Himālaya and so on go to the word 'Himālaya' and so on which was uttered in the Deccan and stay there,[43] because of the fault of non-perception of something which is capable [of being perceived]. And sound, as well as ether and so on, does not have motion, so [in short] how can these have conjunction?

[The *sūtrakāra*] sums up [the discussion by saying]—

Word and object have no connection.[44] 7.2.21

Supply 'therefore.'

[To object that we do have a qualified cognition of e.g. a person] through a staff which has conjunction [with him] and [a qualified cognition of a cow] through a horn which has inherence [in it][45] [, and that therefore, similarly, word and object are connected]: [this][46] is not a [valid] logical ground[47] because [in those cases (?) a real connection (?)] is seen [but in the case of word and object it is not].[48] 7.2.22

43 There is a rather large lacuna here, which I have conjecturally restored in a fashion which I believe yields good sense, is stylistically acceptable and accounts for all the legible *akṣaras*. The preparer of Thakur's transcript probably did not try hard enough here: he seems to have failed to read the *akṣara* before and the one after the lacuna, for Thakur prints *dakṣiṇāpathoccāritahimavadādi*[*bhiḥ samaṃ saṃyujya*]*nte*. This is incidentally also syntactically improbable: the *samam* (*saṃ√yuj*) is unnecessary and odd, and has no parallel that I can see in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings.

44 It is not improbable that *asambandhau* is a scribal error for *asambaddhau*, as read by Candrānanda. However the manuscript reading is interpretable, and Śaṃkara Miśra also appears to have read *asambandhau*.

45 Taking *saṃyoginaḥ* and *samavāyinaḥ* as ablatives agreeing with *daṇḍāt* and *viṣāṇāt* respectively, rather than as genitives, as might also be possible. Nothing can be said with certainty about Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's intentions on this point, but Candrānanda is explicit: *saṃyogisamavāyibhyāṃ daṇḍaviṣāṇābhyāṃ daṇḍiviṣāṇinoḥ pratyayo dṛṣṭaḥ* (60.3).

46 Understanding as if there were an *iti* in the text: the same is necessary in, for instance, 6.1.2 (cf. footnote 8 above). Candrānanda reads this as two sūtras, and prefaces the second, *dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ* (7.2.21 in his text) with *naitat* (60.5). As my translation shows, I suspect that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra also understands *dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ* as an answer to an opponent's argument, though unfortunately the commentary as it survives here is far from being completely clear.

47 There is, I think, insufficient reason to emend by adding *pratyayaḥ* to agree with Candrānanda's reading.

48 The interpretation and therefore translation of this sūtra is quite uncertain, particularly with regard to the word *dṛṣṭatvāt*. Candrānanda interprets his 7.2.21 as follows: *daṇḍiviṣāṇinor dṛṣṭatvād adoṣaḥ, iha tu śabdārthayoḥ sambandhasyoktanyāyenādṛṣṭatvād ahetur arthapratyayaḥ sambandhe* (60.7–8): 'Since [the man] with the staff and [the cow] with the horn are [actually]

In [cognitions] such as 'The cow has a horn' the fact that [this is] a cognition of [something as] qualified is inconclusive [and therefore not a valid logical ground].[49]

Because there is no such cognition.[50] 7.2.23

seen [as such], there is no fault [in claiming that in those cases the fact that seeing one thing can produce a cognition of another thing as qualified by the former proves the existence of a real connection between the two]. In this case, however, because according to the principle that has already been taught [in C's 7.2.15–18] we do not see a connection between word and object, the cognition of an object [from hearing the word associated therewith] is not a [valid] logical ground for [the inference of] a [real] connection.'* See also the following footnote.

* Houben, in translating C's 7.2.21 'following Candrānanda's version as well as his commentary' gives the following rendering (1992, 73): '[The answer is: This is not so.] Because [the staff- and horn-bearer or their relations] are observed, [there is no fault in those cases. But here, because the relation of *śabda* and *artha* is not observed in accordance with the mentioned rule,] the understanding [of the *artha*] is without cause [as far as the relation is concerned].' On one significant point this interpretation is probably unaccceptable: the rendering of *ahetuḥ* as a bahuvrīhi adjective qualifying *pratyayaḥ*. This simply does not yield good sense—note that Houben's '[as far as the relation is concerned],' rendering Candrānanda's *sambandhe*, does not succeed in improving this. It is hardly the Vaiśeṣika's intention to say that the understanding of an object from hearing the word associated with it is 'without a cause [as far as a relation is concerned],' rather what is said is that contrary to what the opponent argues in the previous sūtra, the fact that one understands an object from a word does not prove that the two are connected (or 'related,' in Houben's terminology, which I think less happy)—see the last bit of Candrānanda's commentary on the preceding sūtra, his 7.2.20, *asti ca śabdād arthapratyayaḥ, tasmād asyāpi sambandho 'stīti* (60.3–4; this is rendered accurately enough by Houben, op. cit. loc. cit.). Rather than 'without cause,' *ahetu* means 'a non-*hetu*,' in other words something which is not a valid inferential mark. That this usage is the normal one may be demonstrated, if that is necessary, by adducing the sole other occurrence of the word in Candrānanda's commentary: ad 3.1.10, *aprasiddho 'napadeśaḥ*, he glosses *anapadeśaḥ* with *ahetuḥ*. The context of the entire passage makes unambiguously clear that the topic being discussed is what is a valid inferential mark and what is not. Cf. similarly *aliṅgam* in (C's) 2.1.21.

49 The commentary is all too brief here, but from the little to go on I propose that what is meant by 'inconclusive' is that one may have cognitions of something as qualified without there being a real connection by *saṃyoga* or *samavāya*. In that case, perhaps Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands the opponent as saying: 'We have the notion that word and object are connected, and therefore they are connected by *saṃyoga* or *samavāya*, just as we have the notion that a cow has a horn (i.e. is connected with a horn) and it is clear that it indeed does,' and replies to this: 'But the fact that one has a cognition of something as qualified (i.e. connected) does not allow such a conclusion, for one may have such cognitions without either of those two relations being present.' If asked for an example, he might perhaps have adduced cognitions such as *caturviṃśatir guṇāḥ* or *putravān devadattaḥ*.
This interpretation requires of course that *sambandha* be interpreted as '*saṃyoga* or *samavāya*.' What remains particularly unclear is how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra interprets *dṛṣṭatvāt* in the sūtra.

50 There is apparently no commentary preserved on this cryptic sūtra, which could also be taken differently. Thus Candrānanda (Śaṃkara Miśra does not have the sūtra) clearly reads as two words, *tathā pratyayābhāvaḥ*, commenting as follows: *yadi śabdo 'rthena sambaddhaḥ syād agṛhītasaṅketo 'pi tato 'rthaṃ pratipadyeta | tasmād asambaddhau* (60.10–11). 'If it were the

[And because there may be a] doubt.[51] 7.2.24

Having put forward the thesis that [cognitions are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) connection, if a qualified cognition occurs[52] there would be a doubt: 'Is [the cognition of something as qualified] preceded by (i.e. caused by) a connection or not?'[53] [It

case that word is connected with object then even a man who has not grasped (i.e. learned) the [linguistic] agreements/conventions would have cognition of the object from it (i.e. the word). [But this is not the case:] therefore [word and object] are not connected.' An attempt to translate the sūtra in accordance with this commentary would yield something like 'And (*tathā*) there is no cognition [of the object from hearing the word in the case of someone unfamiliar with the relevant linguistic convention].' For another translation, not radically different, see Houben 1992, 74.

In the light of what I tentatively propose as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's interpretation of the previous sūtra (see the previous footnote), however, I have deviated from this understanding of 7.2.23, the only one which is accessible to us, since ŚM does not have the sūtra. I suggest that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may have understood this as a second answer to the opponent's argument for a real connection between word and object: we do not actually have cognitions of word and object as connected in the same way that we do of a cow and its horn.

Thakur recognized neither this sūtra nor the next as sūtras. Jambūvijaya did, but takes them together as a single sūtra, and is followed in this by Nozawa. Candrānanda however has two, though the second does not agree exactly with the reading we have here of 7.2.24 (see the following footnote), and I see nothing in our commentary which suggests that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra read the sūtras as one. Instead, I am afraid that the entire commentary on this sūtra has been either omitted by the abridger or lost in transmission.

51 Candrānanda reads this sūtra *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*, and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript has *sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ* and the Trivandrum one *sambandhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*, while Śaṃkara Miśra does not know it. It is perhaps conceivable that the . . . *pratijñāya* construction in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is a paraphrase of an . . . *iti cet* and that something should be supplied in the sūtra-text, but if so the missing words can hardly be the same as in any of the other versions: something like *sambandhād iti cet* would be possible. On the whole though, it seems to me that there are insufficient grounds for such a conjecture.

52 My reconstruction here, *yadi viśiṣṭapratyayaḥ syāt*, is no doubt far from certain, but fits fairly well with what is preserved in the manuscript and yields natural syntax. Thakur's [*hetor viśi*]*ṣṭapratyayasyo*[*ktau*] is syntactically unobjectionable but is clearly very different from what was written by the scribe.

53 The line of thought here is difficult to reconstruct. If the text has been constituted correctly, perhaps Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra means something like this: if the cognition of an object that one has on hearing a certain word is caused by a connection between the two, what about cases where the resultant cognition is itself one of the object as qualified by another one? For instance if we hear the word *daṇḍī* and have a cognition of a man with a staff, is there really somewhere a particular staff connected with (i.e. in the hand of) a man with whom the word has a direct connection? This argument seems to me to be in itself a possible one, but I am far from being certain that it is really what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra had in mind here. We may briefly examine the interpretation found in Candrānanda's commentary, although, as mentioned in footnote 51 above, his reading is different—namely *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*. The commentary runs *nanu śabdenākāśaṃ sambaddham, ākāśena cārthaḥ | evaṃ sambaddhasambandhād* arthena sam-*

might be objected: If word and object are not connected] how then [is it possible that] from the word 'Devadatta' a cognition with regard to Devadatta [arises] and not [one] with regard to Yajñadatta? Therefore [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

The cognition of an object through a word is conventional. 7.2.25

'Conventional' means established by convention (*samaya*). [And] 'convention' [means] an agreement (*saṃketa*). A word which is used by agreement (*saṃketyate*) with regard to a particular object creates [when it is used] a cognition[54] of that [object alone] and not of another. Thus through agreement there is restriction (*niyama*); this [is what the sūtra intends to express] (*iti*).

Far[ness] and near[ness] [arise] from two [objects] which are in the same direction [or] time[55] and which are close (*sannikṛṣṭa*) or distant

bandha iti | naitat, sarvārthānām ākāśena sambandhāt kasminn arthe śabdaḥ prayukta iti saṃdehād apratipattiḥ syāt | ato na sambandhaḥ (60.13–15).

* *sambaddhasambandhād*: conj. Jambūvijaya, *sambandhasambandhād* MSS.

'Objection: [even if word and object are not directly connected] ether is connected with the word [as the word inheres in ether] and the object [is connected by conjunction] with ether, [so] in this way [the word] is connected with the object through a "connection to the connected." This is not [correct]: [for if it were], since all objects are connected with ether [one] would [have a] doubt in regard to which object the word was used, and therefore there would be no ascertainment [of the intended object]. Therefore there is no connection [, even of such an indirect type, between word and object].'†

Given the reading he has, this looks plausible enough as an interpretation of the sūtra. It seems to me, however, that it may be ruled out that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's understanding of the sūtra was even vaguely similar. One might note, incidentally, that against such a theory as Candrānanda thinks is put forward here as a *pūrvapakṣa* another objection would have been possible: an indirect connection may exist in the case of normal *mūrta* substances, but according to the Vaiśeṣikas there is no conjunction between the all-pervading substances (cf. p. 127 above and footnote 30 thereon), so there would be no connection between, for example, the word *kāla* and the substance time.

† For another translation of the same passage see Houben 1992, 72. Aside from the English terminology, there is no real difference in our understanding of the passage (although Houben omits translating the last sentence, apparently through an oversight).

54 The manuscript reading, *pratyāyakam*, fits perfectly here, while Thakur's *prayojakam* is incoherent. I assume it springs from an error by the transcriber.

55 Retaining the manuscript reading *ekadikkālābhyām*, which also is found in Candrānanda's recension and the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. Thakur reads *ekadikkābhyām*, presumably, if it does not originate from the transcript, under influence of the same reading in Śaṃkara Miśra's version. In favour of this choice is certainly the fact that the commentary on this sūtra does not speak of time or farness and nearness with regard to time. But I am inclined to put this down to loss of text in the process of abridging or that of transmission. Note that farness and nearness in time are referred to in the commentary on the following, related sūtra, and there is no apparent reason why they should be only introduced there.

(*viprakṛṣṭa*).[56] 7.2.26

Farness and nearness arise from two [objects] which are located in one direction [, for instance] in the east or the west, [and which] are, with respect to one's own body, conjoined by a large or small number of conjunctions with the conjoined (*saṃyukta-saṃyoga*).[57] The usage of the words 'far' and 'near,' which express qualities, with reference to a substance, in [sentences or cognitions such as] 'the cloth is far,' 'the cloth is near' is caused by connection [of the substance] with the qualities far and near [respectively].

Through farness of the cause and through nearness of the cause. 7.2.27

The cause of farness and nearness is enumerative cognition (*apekṣābuddhi*). 'Farness' of this [*apekṣābudddhi*[58] means its] having as its object a large number of

56 Thakur adds a *ca*, not in the manuscript, at the end of this sūtra, probably in order to make it agree with ŚM's reading. Candrānanda and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript do not have the word.

57 Here we have a lacuna not caused by damage to the manuscript; the scribe has left a small space open between °*bhūya* and *yastva*°. Thakur's °*bhūyastvābhūyastva*° is acceptable as far as sense goes, but the wording is far likelier to have been °*bhūyastvālpīyastva*°. Unlike the formulation for which Thakur has chosen, this one is widely found in the texts of the school, including at least one occurrence in the Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra corpus; in his commentary on the section dealing with farness and nearness in the *Kiraṇāvalī* a *pratīka* is introduced with the words *nanu parāparavyavahārayoḥ saṃyuktasaṃyogabhūyastvālpīyastvābhyām utpatter na tato 'dhikaparatvāparatve pramāṇam iti śaṅkate* (GKṬ 86.1–3). Both terms, *bhūyastva* and *alpīyastva*, also recur immediately below, in the commentary on this same sūtra. Elsewhere, it may be noted, we find the order of words in the compound reversed: thus in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the introductory section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* we read at one place *paratvāparatvavirahe saṃyuktasaṃyogālpīyastvabhūyastve durghaṭe, sāmagrīsattvāt paratvāparatvayor avaśyam udayāpatteḥ* (DKṬ 667.12–13: the same order can be found e.g. at NBhū 162.9).
Praśastapāda, be it remarked, does not use the same formula but has the related °*bahvalpabhāva* (164.7).

58 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra gives us here what is certainly one of the wilder flights of his exegetical fancy. The sūtra is in any case rather problematic, but our other sources seem to be agreed in interpreting *kāraṇaparatva* and *kāraṇāparatva* as referring to conjunction (!) with far and distant space and/ or time. This tradition may go back at least to Praśastapāda, who refers to this sūtra in support of the assertion that *saṃyoga* is one of the qualities of time: *kāraṇaparatvād iti vacanāt* saṃyogaḥ* (63.24–64.1). Candrānanda's commentary, which applies the sūtra to farness and nearness in both space and time, also seems to take both words as referring to *saṃyoga*, though he gives no justification for this, writing only *parāparadikpradeśasaṃyogāv asamavāyikāraṇam | tathaiva parāparakālapradeśasaṃyogau | dikkālapradeśaiḥ saṃyogāt sannikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭabuddhyapekṣayā sannikṛṣṭe 'paratvam, viprakṛṣṭe ca paratvam* (61.2–4). Essentially the same explanation is found in the *Vyomavatī* (Vyo^2 vol. 1 129.10–11), the *Nyāyakandalī* (170.11) and the *Kiraṇāvalī* (79.21–22). Śaṃkara Miśra only refers the sūtra to farness and nearness in time, perhaps because of the context in which it is used in the PDhS.
Certainly this widespread tradition with regard to the meaning of the sūtra is not completely sat-

conjunctions with the conjoined[59] or movements of the sun.[60] 'Nearness' of this [means its] having as object a small number of these. It is not correct to say that farness and nearness do not exist, because [we do have] the direct awareness (*anubhava*) that 'this is far' 'this is near.' Farness is being distant and nearness is being close. With respect to time too we have the cognition that an old man is 'far' and a young one 'near.'[61]

Farness and nearness are qualities because, while being different from substance or motion, they possess universals, like colour.[62] The disputed farness and nearness arise from Devadatta's cognition, because, while even when there is connection with [his] sense-organs they are not perceptible to Yajñadatta, they are perceptible to Devadatta, like the number two. Farness and nearness arise from conjunction of [a substance] with form and [a substance] without form,[63] because, while having a single substance [as *samavāyikāraṇa*] and being perceptible to [ordinary people] like us and while there is no cause of non-apprehension, such as an obstacle, those [farness and nearness] which are not perceptible to one person are perceptible to another, like pleasure and so on.

The absence of farness and nearness in farness and nearness is

isfactory, but Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's deviation from it inspires even less confidence.

* I prefer this reading found in, among others, J_1 and the group of Bengali manuscripts of the PDhS and supported by the *Kiraṇāvalī* (79.20), to the *kāraṇaparatvādivacanāt* of the Dvivedin edition. The latter, which also has support from a fair group of manuscripts, including $Ś_1$, probably arose through eyeskip from one *akṣara* with medial *i* to another, combined with the scribes' unfamiliarity with the VS.

59 In other words, when there is a large distance between the observer and the object he is looking at, he has a (presumably very appproximate) enumerative cognition of the number of points in space between himself and the object. The closest of these points is conjoined with the point of space he himself is conjoined with, the next conjoined with that and so on. Cf. e.g. Frauwallner 1956, 228.

60 This applies of course to the case of distance in time. Thakur rightly reads °*tapanaparispanda*° for the °*tavanaparispanda*° of the manuscript; *pa* and *va* are notoriously close in Malayalam script. Incidentally, the editors of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* apparently misunderstood the parallel passage in their text: the same compound appears there twice but both times garbled as *nayanaparispanda*, an error reflecting the transmission of this text in Devanāgarī manuscripts (GKṬ 87.16 and 87.17). Further occurrences in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings are to be found at DKṭ 683.23, 683.27 and 685.4–5.

61 Frauwallner (1956, 112) drew attention to the curious fact that when the Vaiśeṣika texts speak of farness and nearness in time, this is the only case considered: there is no mention of the question of events which took place in the very distant as compared to the very recent past (cf. also Halbfass 1992, 217). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is as we see no exception to this.

62 In this paragraph Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra offers a series of syllogisms to prove various properties of the qualities farness and nearness. Several of the issues involved are discussed in far greater detail in the *Tarkasāgara* ad 2.2.12 (numbered 2.2.10 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version, where almost the entire passage is omitted), 236.13–237.14.

63 I.e. space or time.

> explained by [i.e. in analogy with] atomic and large size. 7.2.28
>
> Motions by motions. 7.2.29
>
> Qualities by qualities. 7.2.30

The meaning of these sūtras has already been understood.

> That[64] from which [arises the cognition] 'this is here' with regard to effect and cause is inherence. 7.2.31

The reference to effect and cause is a partial designation; [one should understand the sūtra as meaning that] that from which [the cognition] 'this is here' arises with regard to effect and cause, quality and quality-possessor, motion and that which possesses it, universal and individual manifestation, [ultimate] particularity and that which possesses it[65] —that is inherence. [For example] 'the cloth is here in the threads' and so on [are cognitions which arise due to inherence].

> The refutation of [inherence] being substance, quality or motion is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) reality. 7.2.32

Just as reality, [i.e.] being (*bhāva* = *sattā*), is not a substance nor a quality nor a motion, for the reasons which have previously been taught,[66] so inherence too [is neither a substance nor a quality nor a motion]. And it is also not one of [the remaining categories, namely] universal, [ultimate] particularity or non-existence, because it is a connection (*sambandha*), like conjunction. Therefore inherence is another [distinct] category.

> [Its] 'it-ness' (i.e. unity)[67] [is explained] by (i.e. in analogy with) being. 7.2.33

64 Like Thakur I find it probable that the correlative *sa* has been lost in transmission, due to haplography. Among other recensions, only the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts also omit the *sa*, but these may well be independent occurrences of the same error.

65 Thakur's conjectural addition of a *ca* at the end of this is quite unnecessary: compare also the wording (without a final *ca*) of a similar list in the *avataraṇa* to 7.2.10 above.

66 Namely in VS 1.2.9–11 (numbering as in Candrānanda). To recapitulate these reasons briefly: being is not a substance because it has (i.e. can have) a single substance as its locus (1.2.9), it is not a quality or a motion because it occurs in qualities and motions (1.2.10) and finally the fact that no lower universal such as substance-ness occurs in it also demonstrates that it can be none of the first three categories (1.2.11). The last of these sūtras is missing in V, presumably lost in abridging or transmission. It is found in the full version (TS 188.4).

67 The somewhat curious usage of *tattva* in the VS to mean, apparently, unity, has hardly been studied yet.* The sūtra *tattvaṃ bhāvena* also occurs elsewhere in the VS, as (Candrānanda's) 2.1.28, 2.28 and 2.2.14 (it is noteworthy that in the sūtra corresponding with the one we are now dealing with, 7.2.31, Candrānanda has the anomalous reading *tattvaṃ ca*). At the first occurrence (numbered 2.1.32 in Thakur's edition) the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary

'It-ness' [means] 'its' condition of being.[68] [What is meant is that] the very same inherence [which is the relation] of thread and cloth is also the inherence [which is the relation] of universal and individual manifestation. The formal syllogism [on this point runs as follows]: the inherence of universal and individual manifestation and so on is not different from the inherence of thread and cloth, because it is inherence, like the inherence of thread and cloth.[69] And [another reason that inherence is one is] because there is no inferential mark which establishes[70] that the inherence [in the two cases] is different. If [one objects that there is such an inferential mark, formulating a syllogism as follows:] the inherence of thread and cloth is different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation and so on, because it is a connection between thread and cloth, like a conjunction between thread and cloth [, to this we reply]: No, because [the alleged logical ground] has an *upādhi*[71] due

has *tasya bhāvas tattvam* (as here), *tato bhedābhāvaḥ* (25.1). Rather oddly, in Thakur's edition of the long commentary, we find 2.1.31 and 2.1.32 together followed merely by *iti sūtradvayam gatārtham* (TS 231.5); what makes this particularly suspicious is that it is followed by a footnote in which Thakur informs us after this there is a very large lacuna in his transcript(s).
Cf. e.g. Faddegon's remarks '[t]hat *tattva* here [i.e. in Śaṃkara Miśra's 7.2.28] means *ekatva* is confirmed by comparing the passage V.S. II, 1, 29–30 with the redaction of V.S. I. 2. 17 and by the information received from the Praçastapāda-bhāṣya' (1918, 122). On an apparently very similar use of *tattva* by Bhartṛhari see Houben 1992, 246–247.

68 The translation is awkward; the analysis is of course based on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.1.119 *tasya bhāvas tvatalau*.

69 In his *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra gives a different but related syllogism to prove the unity of inherence: *samavāyaikatve 'numānam—vipratipannaḥ samavāyas tantupaṭasamavāyād bhinnatvānadhikaraṇam,* samavāyalakṣaṇavattvāt, tantupaṭasamavāyavad iti* (DKṬ 638.18–20).
* *bhinnatvānadhikaraṇam*: em., *bhinnatvānadhikaraṇa°* DKṬ.

70 My restoration of the small lacuna in the manuscript here differs slightly from Thakur's, chiefly because there is space for several more *akṣara*s than he supplies. The sense of the passage is however hardly affected by this difference. The use of the expression °*sādhakaliṅga* is attested within Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works at least once; in the *Tarkasāgara* ad VS 1.2.28 (there is no parallel in the abridged version), one of the interpretations given involves taking the *salliṅgāviśeṣāt* of the sūtra to imply *ghaṭasattāsādhakaliṅgasya sarvatrāviśeṣāt sarvatra ghaṭasattāsiddheḥ* (TS 189.30–31).

71 Like Matilal (1968, 84), I leave *upādhi* untranslated when it occurs in this particular sense, which may be expressed as that of 'a property that pervades the probandum but not the probans' (ibid. loc. cit. n.7). The history of this concept has yet to be written; for a valuable study, though based on material later than our text, see especially Frauwallner's monograph of 1970 on the *upādhi* section of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Among more recent literature the remarks in Gerow 1990 (x n.14, 21 n.100 and n.103, 47 n.241 and 57 n.304), though not historically oriented, may be of some interest. Recent attempts to give an English equivalent have varied from 'obstruction' (Potter and Bhattacharyya 1993, passim) to 'precondition' (Gerow 1990, 20) and 'condition' (Gerow 1990, 47), while Frauwallner's choice in German fell on 'zusätzliche Bestimmung' (1970, passim). None of these is very successful in conveying the intention, if we consider how the logicians themselves understand the term, with definitions such as *sādhyavyā-*

to the absence of the defining mark of inherence.[72]

Thus the seventh *adhyāya*.

pakatve sati sādhanāvyāpaka upādhiḥ (attributed to Udayana in i.a. the *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī* as quoted in the *Nyāyakośa* s.v., p. 179).

72 To interpret Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as I think we should, in the light of Udayana's conception of *upādhi* (cf. the previous footnote) rather than with the aid of the subtleties later considered by Gaṅgeśa and his followers: the inference offered by the opponent cannot be accepted because there is a property, namely 'the absence of the defining mark of inherence' or, to paraphrase, 'the fact of not being inherence,' which pervades the property to be proved, in this case 'the being different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation,' but does not pervade the logical ground, in this case 'the being a connection between thread and cloth.' For in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's view everything that is different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation lacks the defining mark of inherence (i.e. is not inherence), but only some of the possible connections (i.e. relations) between thread and cloth lack this defining mark (i.e. are not inherence but instances of conjunction). And the existence of such a property entails that the property to be proved does not pervade the logical ground, in other words that the logical ground is not invariably concomitant with the property to be proved (cf. e.g. Potter and Bhattacharyya 1993, 72–73).

PART II

CANDRĀNANDA'S COMMENTARY ON THE VS

In this part a new edition is presented of a portion of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS. This commentary is the oldest one we have on the sūtras, and the recension of the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains is thus also quite probably the earliest one now available.[1] A re-edition of the complete commentary is currently nearing completion. Partly because a broader manuscript basis was used than by the *editor princeps*, the Jaina monk and scholar Muni Jambūvijaya, it has been possible to improve on his work in some places. His edition remains nonetheless a most impressive achievement, an example of scholarship of a rare order.

2.1 Candrānanda

About the author of this commentary on the VS there is little that is known and not very much ground for conjecture. Nor do I have anything very significant to add to what has been already observed.

Briefly, then, we have no certain indications as to the time in which Candrānanda lived. As *terminus post quem* we may take A.D. 600 or thereabouts, on the strength of Candrānanda's explicit reference to Uddyotakara and his quotation of the latter's *Nyāyavārttika* (cf. Candrānanda ad VS 3.2.4, 29.4). The *terminus ante quem* cannot be established with as much certainty, but Aklujkar has pointed out close similarities between portions of Helārāja's commentary on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and passages of Candrānanda's commentary. He considers that these are 'obviously quoted from his [i.e. Candrānanda's] *vṛtti*' (1970, 340): this seems a little over-certain, but I agree that this is at least a plausible assumption.[2] Helārāja

1 It cannot be excluded though that one of the two recensions which are currently known from manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* alone (see Part III below) goes back to a redaction of the sūtras which pre-dates Candrānanda.

2 The chief other possibility that is to be reckoned with is that both authors have drawn on some earlier exegetical work current in Kashmir.

being assigned with considerable certainty to the tenth century (cf. e.g. Aklujkar 1970, 340), this period would then be the latest in which Candrānanda might have flourished.

Another possible citation of our commentator has been pointed out by Shah. In Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*, a work which was completed in November A.D. 1014 (cf. Shah 1975, 7), a verse is quoted which is attributed to Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda. The subject is unrelated with Vaiśeṣika topics, and the verse hints rather at a monistic background; perhaps for this reason the reference is not always adduced as evidence for the Vaiśeṣika author's date.[3] However there is no reason why the same author should not have written works dealing with quite different systems: there are many examples of this that we know of, and even some reason to think that Abhinavagupta himself may have written a commentary on the PDhS.[4] The name Candrānanda is not a common one; the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (vol. 6, 1971, 374) has entries for our author and for the Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda quoted by Abhinavagupta, and lists no others with the same name.[5] Abhinavagupta's time and place of activity being also very close to those of Helārāja, I am inclined provisionally to accept this too as a genuine reference to our commentator.

As far as the—weaker—internal evidence of thought and style is concerned, I find myself in agreement with Chemparathy, who writes 'judging from the contents and the style of his work I feel strongly inclined to place this commentary before the tenth century, probably in the seventh or eighth century, this latter precision being hypothetical' (1970, 48).

A dissenting view has been mentioned by Potter, who ranks Candrānanda among a group of 'a few undatable writers,' reporting that 'estimates of his date differ widely. Sandesara suggests the 7th century,[6] but Hattori thinks it is much later, possibly after our period altogether' (1977, 685). 'Our period' here presumably means the period up to approximately A.D. 1350 (cf. Potter 1977, xi). No reference is given to a publication of Hattori, however, nor do I know of any in which such a view is expressed. As far as I can see, not the slightest trace of evidence can be found in the commentary itself for so late a date.

As to the geographical region in which Candrānanda lived and wrote, the indications, admittedly not conclusive, that we have point clearly to Kashmir. Thus the two authors who, as we have seen, may have known his writings both hail from that area, and the manuscripts of his commentary are either written in Śāradā or can be

3 Thus Nozawa (1993a, 97a–b), for instance, cites Aklujkar 1970 but not Shah 1975.

4 Cf. footnote 44 on p. 333 below.

5 Under the entry for the author of the VS commentary, NCC (loc. cit.) also lists another, unpublished, work, the title of which is given as *Niśśreyasādhigamaprakaraṇa*. The reference is to the *Jainagranthāvalī*, which I have not been able to check.

6 Potter refers to Sandesara's forward to Jambūvijaya's edition, p. viii.

shown to have descended from manuscripts in that script (cf. p. 145ff. below).

Little appears to have been written on Candrānanda as an individual thinker. This is not too surprising though, for, unlike Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in his long commentary, Candrānanda confines himself by and large quite strictly to explanation of the sūtras, without digressing and also usually without discussion of various possible interpretations or theories. The impression one receives most strongly on reading his commentary is that he is deeply influenced by Praśastapāda, and on most points faithful to the latter's thought. Close verbal parallels with the PDhS, including literal, unattributed, quotations are frequent.[7]

The only study so far devoted exclusively to an aspect of Candrānanda's philosophy is Chemparathy's brief article on the commentator's theology (1970). Chemparathy leaves open the question whether there is anything original in what Candrānanda says in the few passages where God and His qualities are mentioned, writing 'although his proof for the existence of Īśvara based on the names given to objects may be deduced from an earlier proof of Praśastamati [i.e. Praśastapāda],—and Candrānanda himself seems to ascribe it to others before him.[8] yet so far I have not come across another author who has formulated a direct argument for the existence of Īśvara from the naming of objects' (1970, 51).

Nevertheless, there is at least one siginificant point which should be mentioned, in which Candrānanda deviates not only from Praśastapāda but indeed from all other Vaiśeṣika writers I know of, and which he does not attribute to others. In his commentary on VS 4.1.8, part of a section of the VS that deals with perception (4.1.6–14), he mentions in passing that triads (*tryaṇukas*) are not perceived. This is contrary to the view, which is otherwise unanimous as far as I know, that since triads are the smallest substances which are technically speaking 'large' (*mahat*), they can be perceived by ordinary people. This view of Candrānanda's is repeated even more explicitly in his commentary on 7.1.15, where he remarks that though triads are large they are not perceived.[9]

7 Cf. Werba's characterization (Frauwallner 1992, 137 n. 9) 'die 1961 von JAMBUVIJAYAJI veröffentlichte Vṛtti Candrānandas (VV) mit ihren zahlreichen, bisher unbeachtet gebliebenen Parallelen zu Praśastapādas Text,' and also Isaacson 1990, 14–15, 22 n. 36 and 25 n. 41 n. 43 and n. 44.

8 The passage which Chemparathy has in mind, and refers to in his footnote at this point (n. 24), is the commentary on VS 6.1.3, which runs *vinopadeśena brāhmaṇādikam artham asmākam ālocayatāṃ pratyakṣeṇa na brāhmaṇo 'yam iti jñānam utpadyate | pratyakṣeṇa cārtham ālocya saṃjñāpraṇayanaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ putrādiṣu | santi caitā brāhmaṇādisaṃjñāḥ, tā yena pratyakṣam artham ālocya praṇītā iti sūtrārthaṃ varṇayanti* (45.14–16). I think that from the concluding words one may be more confident that the idea expressed here is not one formulated for the first time by Candrānanda than is implied by Chemparathy's 'seems to ascribe it to others before him.'

9 Cf. Isaacson 1990, 16–17 n. 20. Dr. K. Preisendanz has informed me that she independently

Aside from this one unique feature, which may of course also have been taken over by Candrānanda from some lost writer(s), there are perhaps a few small points where Candrānanda differs from Praśastapāda at least in emphasis. Attention shall be drawn to these as they occur, in the textual and exegetical commentary on the edited text.[10]

2.2 The *editio princeps*

Though the existence of a commentary by Candrānanda on the VS has been known since 1874 or so,[11] the *editio princeps* was not published until 1961. The editor was the Jaina Muni Jambūvijaya,[12] one of the most distinguished Jaina scholars of this century. This edition was not surprisingly received with gratitude and admiration by the most prominent scholars working in the field. Anantalal Thakur, who had himself made a similar contribution a few years earlier with his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS (cf. Part I of this thesis), contributed a lengthy introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. Even more weight may be accorded to Erich Frauwallner's review of the edition of Candrānanda's commentary, which appeared in the WZKSO in 1962. At this time, Frauwallner could already be regarded as the world's leading expert on early Vaiśeṣika, on the strength of the publication in 1956 of his impressive study in the second volume of his *Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie*. His review accorded the edition unreserved praise. There could of course be no doubt as to the importance of the text itself, of which Frauwallner rightly remarked that it must be used in all future work on the early Vaiśeṣika.[13] As for the quality of the editorial work, Frauwallner had the following to say.

made the same observation.

10 Cf. e.g. p. 184 below.

11 The year in which manuscript J_2 was collected—and indeed also copied (cf. p. 146 below). The 1873–1874 collection was made by Bühler (cf. the Preface of Bhandarkar 1888); the Report is not available to me directly, but the list in Bhandarkar 1888 is said in the Preface to be a reprint of one published earlier.

12 On the titlepage of the book the honorific -ji is added to the editor's name. I omit the suffix because Jambūvijaya himself does not seem to use it (cf. the conclusion of his Sanskrit introduction) and because it is not found on the titlepages of several of his other editions and publications.

13 Unfortunately, even more than a quarter-century after the publication of Jambūvijaya's edition, articles and books continue to appear which base their statements and conclusions about the early Vaiśeṣika on the text of the VS as commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra, and do not refer to, or even appear to be aware of, Candrānanda's commentary and the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains. A striking example is formed by a book by Veena Gajendragadkar, *Kaṇāda's Doctrine of the Padārthas i.e. the Categories*, Delhi 1988.

> Darüber hinaus erhält die vorliegende Ausgabe durch die Leistung des Herausgebers besonderen Wert. Nicht nur daß die Herstellung des Textes aufs sorgfältigste unter Heranziehung alles erreichbaren Materials erfolgte, und daß dem Text alles beigegeben ist, was zu einer wissenschaftlichen Ausgabe gehört, Vergleich der verschiedene Sūtra-Versionen, Sūtra-Index usw. Der Herausgeber hat überdies das Werk durch eine Reihe wertvoller Beigaben bereichert. . . Schließlich ist noch die Fülle wertvoller Angaben zu erwähnen, welche in den Anmerkungen enthalten ist. So stellt das Werk eine ungewöhnliche Quelle für alle weitere Forschung dar, für welche der Herausgeber wärmsten Dank verdient.

Coming from such an authority as Frauwallner, justly renowned for both philological and philosophical acumen, it is understandable that such a judgement should have set the tone for the further reception of this edition. Indeed, I can hardly think of a single scholar who has expressed really critical remarks about this edition, or even hinted that a revised or new edition might ever be desirable.[14] It may therefore come as a surprise—or even be taken as an example of presumption—that someone should think it necessary to attempt such a new edition. Nonetheless, as I have tried to show elsewhere,[15] like any edition and especially any pioneering edition, Jambūvijaya's work, careful though it is on the whole, can be improved on. One reason for this is that there are manuscripts of the commentary which Jambūvijaya did not use, and seems indeed not to have known of. Another is that Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus is rather incomplete and not free of errors, so that even if his proposed reading is acceptable the precise evidence on which it is based is often not accurately presented. Finally, there are some places where although no new, different, reading is available, I feel unable to fully concur with my predecessor's text-critical decisions; this category is not a very large one but contains nonetheless a few instances which are of some importance for interpretation.

14 Least of all, apparently, did Jambūvijaya himself feel any change to be necessary. A reprint of his edition appeared in 1982, and in the Foreword by A.N. Jani we read that 'Muni Śrī Jambūvijayajī was requested to revise the work but he replied that the work needs no revision. Hence it is reprinted after correcting the misprints' (cf. also footnote 16 on p. 145 below). Incidentally, despite this last remark, the reprint fails to correct most of the misprints of the first edition, nor does it include the original *śuddhipatrakam*. Instead, a sprinkling of new misprints has been added. Scholars should therefore be warned that though the reprint at first sight seems to be a photo-mechanical one, the text has been reset. If at all possible, the first edition only should be used.

15 In especially section IV of Isaacson 1995.

2.3 The manuscripts of the commentary

As has been mentioned, one of the chief reasons to take up this task is the availability of manuscript material that had not been used in the *editio princeps*. As far as I am aware at present, there are five extant manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary, i.e. three besides the two which Jambūvijaya knew of and used.

2.3.1 Description of the manuscripts

The following list introduces the sigla by which the various manuscripts will be designated in the rest of this part and provides some description. In view chiefly of the number of manuscripts, these descriptions have been kept very brief; I intend to give a fuller account of them elsewhere. All of the manuscripts are written on paper.

J_1 A manuscript which formerly belonged to Muni Puṇyavijaya and has now passed into the collection of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad.[16] Muni Puṇyavijaya allowed Jambūvijaya the use of this manuscript, and it is designated in Jambūvijaya's edition by the siglum P. As far as I am aware, it has not been catalogued by the L.D. Institute.

For Jambūvijaya's description of the manuscript see p. 2 of his Sanskrit introduction (*prastāvanā*). A slightly less detailed description is given by Thakur in his English introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. The manuscript is written in Jaina Devanāgarī script and consists of 34 folios. Size 23.0 × 8.3 cm.[17] There is no date, nor indeed a final colophon; the remaining space on f. 34v after the final words of the commentary is filled up with *cha*s. According to

16 I am indebted to the kindness and efforts of Muni Jambūvijaya. Prof. A. Wezler and the authorities of the L.D. Institute for providing me with a photocopy of the manuscript. It may be of interest to quote here from a copy Prof. Wezler has given me of a letter written to him by Muni Jambūvijaya, dated 9-3-92: 'The fact is that the ms. was returned to Muni Shri Punyavijayaji who sent it to me. I have completely utilised it in the edition of the *vaiśeṣikasūtra* [this word is written in Devanāgarī script]. I think it is of no use now... It will most probably be in the L. D. Institute, because before his expiration Rev. Muni Shri *puṇyavijayajī mahārāja* [these two words are written in Devanāgarī script] had given all his books, to the Institute.' The view that a manuscript used once for an edition, even by a good and careful scholar, can then be neglected is one which must be deplored (cf. also footnote 14 on p. 144 above); suffice it to point out that in Greek and Latin, not to speak of medieval, text-criticism, there are many cases where we have several editions based on exactly the same manuscripts. To err is human, and it is rare that re-collation does not reveal one or two mistakes in reading.

17 Jambūvijaya gives the dimensions of the manuscript in the words *patrāṇāṃ dairghyaṃ caturdaśāṅgulapramitam | āyāmas tu pañcāṅgulapramitaḥ* (*prastāvanā* p. 2).

Jambūvijaya, 'experts on palaeography, paper and so on' are of the opinion that the manuscript was written in the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era (*vaikrame caturdaśe śatake 'yam ādarśo likhita iti lipipatrādisvarūpavidām abhiprāyaḥ* p.2); I must confess to being a little surprised by the proposal of so early a date (corresponding to the 13th–14th century of the Christian era), but being by no means an expert on palaeography or paper, I am not able to argue forcefully against it.

Before the text of the commentary, with the sūtras embedded therein, the manuscript contains the entire *sūtrapāṭha* alone, in a form which agrees very closely with that in which it is found in the commentary. It seems on the whole most plausible that, as Wezler suggests, 'this *sūtrapāṭha* has to be viewed as extracted from Candrānanda's commentary itself rather than forming part of the tradition to which Candrānanda or a copyist had access' (1982, 644), though the latter possibilities should I think still be kept in mind. For this section of the manuscript I use the siglum J_1^s; Jambūvijaya calls it PS.

J_1 is the only one of the manuscripts which has marginal corrections in what appears to be a hand distinct from that of the original scribe.

J_2 Manuscript in the BORI, No. 99 of 1873–74. Jaina Devanāgarī script. 20 folios. Size 18.5 × 31.5 cm. Dated *saṃvat* 1931, corresponding to A.D. 1874/1875. In view of the date in which the manuscript was collected, it must have been copied in A.D. 1874; small wonder that Bhandarkar's catalogue (1888, 59) calls it a 'N.C.' i.e. new copy. The catalogue gives 'Jesalmîr' as the place where the manuscript was bought.

Like J_1 this manuscript begins with the *sūtrapāṭha* alone; for this section I use the siglum J_2^s.

$Ś_1$ Manuscript in the Oriental Institute, Baroda, no. 1831h. This is the manuscript to which Jambūvijaya assigns the siglum O. Jambūvijaya's description may again be found on p. 2 of his *prastāvanā*, and Thakur's, in English, on p. 1 of his Introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. It forms part of a codex with several texts described in Jambūvijaya's words as *tarkabhāṣādidvādaśapustakāni* (loc. cit.); only the folios with Candrānanda's commentary are available to me. The commentary begins on f. 6r and ends on f. 41v. The final folio is unnumbered. The manuscript is undated; Thakur calls it 'not very old' (loc. cit.), and is probably right in this, though as usual I find it difficult to be certain about dating Śāradā manuscripts.

Ś₂ Manuscript in the BORI, No. 403 of 1875–76. Śāradā script. 33 folios. Size 26.5 × 17 cm. Undated; very similar in appearance to Ś₁. This is the only one of the Śāradā manuscripts which is not a 'Sammelhandschrift.'

Ś₃ Manuscript in the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, No. 4635.[18] Śāradā script. The manuscript contains first the text of the *Tarkasaṃgraha* followed by that of the commentary *Tarkadīpikā* thereon. After that our text follows, beginning on f. 22r15 and ending on f. 35r. The verso of f. 35 (which is not numbered) contains the beginning of another text, which I have not identified. There are no further folios preserved. In contrast to the usual practice in manuscripts written in Śāradā script the writing runs parallel to the longest sides, as in the customary format for manuscripts in other scripts. Only f. 35v has standard Śāradā layout, with the writing parallel to the shorter sides. The hand is quite different from that of Ś₁ and Ś₂, being smaller, with less contrast between the thicks and thins of the pen-strokes, and with the lines quite close together. The page therefore makes a dense and uninviting appearance. Sūtras and colophons have been marked with what looks like red pencil or crayon. The general appearance of both paper and script suggest that the manuscript is considerably younger than Ś₁ and Ś₂.

At the end of our text there is a scribal colophon reading *saṃ 64 bhā* (i.e. *bhādrapade*) *śu* (i.e. *śuklapakṣe*) *di* (i.e. *divase*) *ṣaṣṭhyāṃ bhaume pūritam etan madhusūdanena svopayogārtham* (f. 35r23). The date is obviously one in the *saptarṣi* or *laukika* era, with the century omitted, as is unfortunately common practice (cf. Slaje 1993, 24). Prof. M. Yano has kindly informed me that the date can in this case be verified with a high degree of probability as corresponding to Tuesday September 11th, 1888.[19]

The Śāradā manuscripts collectively, or a reading shared by all of them, will be designated with the siglum Ś.

A concordance of all the manuscripts with Jambūvijaya's edition will be found as Appendix 2.

18 I am indebted to Mr. D. Goodall for informing me of the existence of this manuscript, and to Dr. Śītāṃśu Rath and other authorities of the Scindia Oriental Institute for allowing me to photograph it.

19 Prof. Yano responded to the electronic bulletin-board 'Indology' on Tuesday March 14th, 1995 (Message-Id ⟨0098D5B0.FE8F60EC.14@ksuvx0.kyoto-su.ac.jp⟩), answering my question regarding the verification of this date posted in the same forum on Monday March 13th, 1995.

2.3.2 The relationship between the manuscripts

Fortunately the manuscript tradition of Candrānanda's commentary as we have it seems to present a fairly straightforward picture. Manuscript affiliations are easily determined and clear-cut; a fact that is indicative of a rather slender transmission, i.e. one with a relatively small number of manuscripts, and freedom from contamination. It should be noted in this connection that the manuscripts can be associated with a rather limited geographical area beyond which we have no evidence that Candrānanda's commentary ever spread.

Collation shows that the five manuscripts fall into two well-defined groups; on the one hand the two in Jaina Devanāgarī and on the other the three Śāradā manuscripts. In the case of the first of these groups, the evidence that J_2 (which, as will be remembered, is a very recent manuscript) is a direct descendant of J_1, very probably an immediate one, i.e. an apograph, is overwhelming. As has been noticed, these manuscripts agree strikingly already in the matter of the formal organization of their contents, with both giving at the outset the text of the sūtras alone and following this with Candrānanda's commentary, with the sūtras embedded in it. The extent to which they agree in error both in matters of substantives and accidentals is also most striking, and I think all of J_2's divergencies from J_1 can be explained as typical scribal errors. It is particularly important to note that there are cases where J_2's reading is that of J_1 *post correctionem*, with the correction in J_1 being one which can be convincingly argued to be a wrong one not based on the/an exemplar; for an instance of this see p. 181 below. This indicates that the close agreement of the two sources is not caused by their sharing a common ancestor, but that J_2 must indeed have descended from J_1. In my opinion, the relationship between these two manuscripts may be regarded as established with as much certainty as is ever possible on the strength of internal evidence alone. We may therefore eliminate J_2 as an independant witness; its use seems confined to the confirmation of readings in J_1 which may be difficult to make out.

The Śāradā manuscripts are also very closely related, with a large number of mistakes held in common. To be brief, it is certain that they share a common ancestor which was itself corrupt at quite a few places and lacunose at others. None of them is however an apograph or descendant of another.

I shall present a small selection only of the evidence which leads me to these conclusions. First of all the Śāradā manuscripts all must descend from an ancestor that was damaged or lacunose. This is most clearly indicated at the very end of the commentary, ad 10.20–21, where they all at three places indicate by dashes the defective nature of their original.[20] Interesting is that at one of these places $Ś_2$ reads

20 This can be clearly seen in the reproduction of the final folio of $Ś_1$ which is given as Plate II in

two more syllables than $Ś_1$ and $Ś_3$; this is one of a number of indications that the latter two cannot have been copied from $Ś_2$, nor, most probably, $Ś_2$ from one of the others. Instead $Ś_2$ is regularly a little better than $Ś_1$ or $Ś_3$; whether this is because it was copied directly from the hyparchetype manuscript when that was in slightly better condition or because the scribe has here and there himself improved the text of his original it is not possible to say.

In addition, there is a large number of significant errors shared by all three manuscripts which can hardly be explained as purely coincidental. I restrict myself to a few examples, drawn from portions of the work of which a re-edition is not included below. Many other, equally striking, cases can be found easily enough from the critical apparatus.

1. In the commentary on 3.2.3 we read *ataḥ prayatnajñānāyaugapadyād ekaṃ manaḥ pratiśarīraṃ mūrtam asparśaṃ niravayavaṃ nityam aṇv āśucārīti* (28.11–12). No variants are given by Jambūvijaya, but all the Śāradā manuscripts read *āśukārīti* for *āśucārīti*. The latter reading of J_1 is confirmed by Praśastapāda's *āśusaṃcāri ceti* (PDhS 89.20) and by the sense; the *manas* may be said to move (rapidly) but hardly to do/act, which is rather the prerogative of the soul.

2. In the sentence that forms part of the commentary on 6.1.4, *yata eva parameśvarasya kṛtir vedādau vākyapadaracanāto 'yaṃ smārto 'pi dānavidhis tadīyam āmnāyam anantaśākhābhinnam ālocya saṃkṣepam anumanyamānānāṃ bhṛguprabhṛtīnāṃ buddhipūrvaḥ* (45.19–20), the Śāradā manuscripts unanimously read *ya eva śrīparameśvarasya* for *yata eva parameśvarasya*.[21] As is quite clear, *ya eva* is an error and *yata eva* must be right; it is highly implausible that all three manuscripts made the mistake independently, especially since there is no obvious factor to have provoked a mechanical error, so this must be evidence of a genetic relationship. The *śrīparameśvarasya* is also very likely to be a secondary reading, as the *śrī* is far more likely to have been added scribally than to have been deleted (cf. also the similar case discussed briefly in the textual commentary on Candrānanda's commentary on 1.1.1, p. 183 below), so this also may count as an indication of common ancestry.

3. The Ś manuscripts all omit a fairly large section of the commentary, from °*vidyā* in 9.25 upto and including *pañcabhyo* in 10.1 (cf. Jambūvijaya's note 6 in the apparatus on p. 70). The colophon of the ninth *adhyāya* is also missing in

Jambūvijaya's edition.

21 Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus here is, as all too often, sadly inaccurate; he wrongly reports $Ś_2$ as reading *evaṃ* instead of *eva*, and does not give the manuscript's really variant readings.

> consequence. There is no apparent cause for eyeskip, and it is incredible that the error should have occurred independently in more than one manuscript.

Aside from numerous such agreements in error, convincing evidence of their close relationship, each also has a number of mistakes and omissions which are unique to it, so that it seems impossible that any one should be an apograph of either of the others. The precise relation between them is difficult to establish; I am at present inclined to believe that Ś$_1$ and Ś$_3$ have a common ancestor and that this lost manuscript and Ś$_2$ are both apographs of the hyparchetype of this recension, σ, as we may call it. To prove this, and to rule out the possibility that instead all three are independent apographs of σ, is a difficult task, and I shall postpone the attempt to a later occasion.[22] For the present, and for virtually all practical purposes of the edition, it is only important that, unlike J$_2$, Ś$_2$ and Ś$_3$ are to be regarded as genuinely new witnesses to the text. Using the Śāradā manuscripts it should be possible, in principle, to reconstruct the readings of their common ancestor, σ, in the majority of cases. This provides a better basis than Jambūvijaya had, for in some places Ś$_1$ has an isolated reading which is unlikely to be that of the hyparchetype.

Next a word as to J$_1$'s ancestry. There are a number of traces which clearly point to J$_1$'s being descended from a manuscript in Śāradā script, and, again, the probability is that this manuscript was J$_1$'s immediate ancestor. We find a number of mistakes which can be associated with typical confusion between Śāradā characters.[23] As an example one might mention the scribe's first writing *svana°* for *svarga°* in the commentary on 6.1.1; *rga*, though quite different from Śāradā *na*, is very like a Jaina Devanāgarī *na* such as the scribe would have been most familiar with. Another similar confusion lies behind *bhedādīnām* for *bheryādīnām* in the *avataraṇa* to 2.1.14; Śāradā *ry* is again very like a (Jaina) Devanāgarī *d*.[24] Significantly, we also find evidence that an ancestor of J$_1$ made occasional use of *jihvāmūlīya*, another feature of Śāradā script which is very rare in Devanāgarī manuscripts: this too has resulted into a number of mistakes. For instance, in 1.1.28 the section of the manuscript which gives the *sūtrapāṭha* separately reads *saṃyogavibhāgāt karmaṇām* for *saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmaṇām*.[25]

22 The reason for the difficulty is the number of manuscripts in the group: as is well known, it is theoretically impossible to definitively determine the relation between three manuscripts with textual analysis alone—the so-called 'ambiguity of three texts' (cf. Greg 1927, 21). Of course codicological and other, not strictly textual, evidence may allow the ambiguity to be resolved, and it is partly with arguments of this type that I hope to be able to settle the problem of our three Śāradā manuscripts.

23 For a list of 'semi-homographe Akṣaras' in Śāradā, with large, clear reproductions, see Slaje 1993, 43–45. A few more could perhaps have been added to the list: thus I see no mention of *śś/śc*, two common ligatures which are virtually indistinguishable in most Śāradā hands.

24 Cf. for another example p. 181 below.

25 Another case which should be noted is the sūtra 8.10: Jambūvijaya's edition reads this *dravyeṣ-*

Let us now briefly consider the relationship between on the one hand Ś (or σ) and on the other J_1 (or its Śāradā ancestor). The presence of a number of readings which cannot but be corruptions in all the manuscripts shows fairly clearly that σ and J_1 may both be descended from a manuscript in which these corruptions were already present, and which must therefore itself be distinct from the presumed 'original' or autograph manuscript.[26] But on the other hand the differences between the two are so numerous and substantial that they are probably at a considerable remove from their common ancestor. As far as I can see, there are no signs of contamination/conflation in any of the manuscripts, and I assume that there has been none. Of course it cannot be ruled out that conflation did take place in the transmission before the archetype; but I find it impossible to say anything precise or useful about this possibility.

2.4 Editorial policy

From its palaeography and appearance it may be safely said that J_1 is the oldest of our manuscripts. But it should be remembered that it has gone through the process of transcription from Śāradā to Jaina Devanāgarī script, leaving in some cases clear traces but perhaps in others corruption which is less easily recognized. Of the Śāradā manuscripts it is plausible to assume that, though there has been more than enough opportunity for scribal error to be introduced, at least the additional factor of transcription from one script to another, fairly different one, did not play a role.

What is more, we have seen that J_1 and on the other hand the Śāradā manuscripts seem to represent two independent lines of descent from a common archetype. Of course it should not be assumed that the relative clarity of the manuscript relationships entails that an editor's decisions can always be clear-cut. The bifurcation of

anitaretarakāraṇāt kāraṇāyaugapadyāt. No variants on this are given in the critical apparatus, but in the *vṛddhipatrakam* Jambūvijaya reports that the Śāradā manuscript and the section of the Jaina Devanāgarī manuscript which gives the sūtras within the commentary read thus, while the first part of the Jaina manuscript, giving the *sūtrapāṭha* alone, reads *dravyeṣv itaretarakāraṇāt kāraṇāyaugapadyāt*. He then adds *'dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ kāraṇāyaugapadyāt' iti pāṭho 'tra samīcīno bhāti* (p. 231). He certainly is right about this, but two points need to be remarked on. First of all, the Śāradā manuscript is in fact not available here as a witness. As was correctly noted in the last entry in the apparatus on p. 62, a large section, including the text of 8.6–13, has been left out in the Śāradā manuscript (and this applies also to the other Śāradā manuscript, not known to Jambūvijaya, which is introduced below). So it is the Jaina Devanāgarī manuscript alone which is present here. Secondly, the reading °*kāraṇāt* which we find in both sections of the manuscript, can with virtual certainty be explained as a misreading of °*kāraṇāḥ* written with (Śāradā) *jihvāmūlīya* before the following *kāraṇāyaugapadyāt*.

26 For discussion of a few such places see p. 190, p. 190 and p. 191 below.

the 'stemma' means instead that when the two branches differ in reading there is no way to decide between the two except by weighing the merits of their respective readings carefully—there is no mechanical way to choose between them. In doing so, we find that both J_1 and the Śāradā manuscripts, frequently seem to preserve the correct reading when the other branch is corrupt. The Ś recension has perhaps on the whole a slightly larger number of serious errors, such as omissions, but it is only with witnesses from both traditions that the text can be constituted more or less satisfactorily.[27] Of course if J_1 and one or two of the Śāradā manuscripts share a reading, the agreement strongly suggests that the variant is archetypal and that the reading(s) of the other Śāradā manuscript(s) are not. This does not mean, however, that the shared reading is original; as was mentioned above (p. 151) the common ancestor seems to have had already a number of errors, and like Jambūvijaya I attempt to correct these, when considerations such as sense, context or parallels allow doing so with some degree of certainty.

Exactly what Jambūvijaya's editorial policy was he does not tell us, and it is difficult to determine. My impression is that he has taken J_1 as his 'copy-text,' and emended it, where he found it necessary to do so, with the single Śāradā manuscript at his disposal; compare his remark on the relative merits of his two manuscripts quoted in footnote 27. As a consequence, there are occasional readings in his text which are found in J_1 and which are quite possible as to sense, but which in my view are likely to be secondary as compared to an equally possible reading of the Ś tradition. In other words, I feel that he has favoured J_1 a little, whereas it has been my endeavour to base my decision on the readings, not on the identity of the manuscript(s) containing them, at all places where the two branches differ. Nonetheless, even though I have tried to weigh the evidence as carefully as possible before—necessarily—taking a decision, there are quite a number of places where only very weak, and somtimes conflicting, arguments can be mustered for choosing one reading over another. For this reason I have endeavoured above all to present the evidence as fully as possible so that others may arrive at their own conclusions. It follows that the differences between the critical apparatus of the new edition and that of the *editio princeps*, which is incomplete and inaccurate to a rather high degree,[28]

27 Compare Jambūvijaya's evaluation of J_1 and $Ś_1$: O-P *ity anayoḥ* P *śuddhataras tathāpi katipayasthāneṣu* O*pāṭha eva samīcīnaḥ* (*prastāvanā* p. 2).

28 A comparison of the apparatus of my edition with that of Jambūvijaya will show this clearly, but even simply from Jambūvijaya's edition alone it is easy to determine this fact. For, very commendably, no less than six plates are given with reproductions of the manuscripts: two of these are of the first and last sides of O (i.e. $Ś_1$) and the other four are of P(S) (i.e. J_1/J_1^S). Any reader is therefore in a position to check the editor's reading and reporting of his manuscripts for a fair sample of the text, and anyone who takes the trouble to do this will find that numerous variants, sometimes significant ones, are not mentioned in Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus. In the textual commentary I have pointed out a number of individual cases in which Jambūvijaya

may be as important as the adoption of different readings in the text itself. It lies within the very nature of editing, i.e. reconstructing, that conclusive results are frequently impossible. To point out cases where a different choice could be equally well defended is one of the functions of the commentary on the text which I have provided (cf. p. 156f. below).

2.5 Conventions of the text and apparatus

The text has been presented in Devanāgarī script, which brings with it the advantage of being more easily readable for many scholars than a Roman transliteration and is also aesthetically more pleasing. The slight reduction in precision which the use of Devanāgarī entails, especially in the reporting of manuscript readings in the apparatus, has been felt to be outweighed by these considerations, as the number of manuscripts is great enough that it is of little importance for the constitution of the text to note all cases where a part of an *akṣara* is unclear.[29]

The sigla used for the various manuscripts have already been introduced on p. 145–147 above. Readings attributed to 'Jambū.' are those of the *editio princeps*. As there is a fair number of witnesses to the text, I have introduced a short-hand for readings shared by all but one: the siglum Σ. The single deviant source is of course always indicated.

Variants on the text of the sūtras are in the topmost layer of apparatus. It will be remembered that for the sūtras we have the additional evidence of J_1^s, so that there are in effect five manuscript witnesses. Entries are keyed to the text by sūtra-number alone. The bottom layer of apparatus records the variants on the text of the commentary. Where necessary, a layer between these two is added, which provides identifications of (or records failure to identify) quotations found in the commentary. In these lower two layers of apparatus lemmas are keyed to the text by line-number references. The use of superscript *ac* (e.g. $Ś_1^{ac}$) to indicate readings before correction and superscript *pc* (e.g. $Ś_1^{pc}$) to indicate readings which result from scribal correction should be clear and familiar.

Like the critical apparatus of the edition of two *adhyāya*s of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's com-

fails to report important variants: cf. for instance footnote 21 on p. 149 above and p. 181 below (the latter case being one which can be checked from Jambūvijaya's Plates).

29 This latter point constitutes the main reason for the difference of my decision here from the one made with regard to the presentation of the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary: in the latter case, with a sole witness for the text, it is far more crucial to achieve maximum precision in reporting the reading of the manuscript. Cf. p. 52 above.

mentary in Part I, the apparatus here is a strictly positive one.[30] Many of the conventions used in the apparatus are identical with those introduced in that edition (see p. 53 above). The divergences are for the greater part related to the quite different nature of the transmission, with four manuscripts compared to the *codex unicus* of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. As lemma sign a] is used, rather than a :, to avoid possible confusion with *visarga*. No brackets have been used in the actual text, and no use is made of double brackets (⟦ ⟧). The apparatus uses the following symbols:

( ) Indicate that the reading of the enclosed *akṣara*(s) in a given manuscript is uncertain.

⟨ ⟩ Enclose *akṣara*s that have been cancelled in a given manuscript.[31]

+ + Enclose *akṣara*s which have been added, in the margin or between the lines, in a given manuscript.[32]

{ } These braces have been used at some places to avoid repetition and keep the size of the apparatus down. Their function can best be explained with an example: an entry of the type *guṇā*{*ṇa* $Ś_1$}*nām* Ś, is a convenient shorthand for *guṇānām* $Ś_2Ś_3$, *guṇanām* $Ś_1$.

. . . Indicates a space-saving ellipsis; used only in lemmas, where the elided text can be easily and unambiguously determined from a glance at the constituted text.

° This symbol stands for the dash at the level of the head-line of the *akṣara*s which is used in the manuscripts (by far most frequently in the Śāradā ones) to indicate a lacuna in or illegibility of their exemplar.

In addition, the following abbreviations are used in the apparatus:

om. Indicates that the text of the lemma is omitted in the specified manuscripts.

30 From working closely with editions prepared by others as well as from trying my hand at editing texts of different kinds myself, I have become convinced that the advantages of a fully positive apparatus far outweigh the additional expenditure of time and space which it demands. Except perhaps in very unusual cases, it is strongly to be urged that this type of apparatus be made the standard in critical editions.

31 Note the difference in the use of these angled brackets as compared with the edition of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary.

32 I am aware of course that these plus-signs are not directional, but believe that there are no cases in the apparatus where confusion is really likely as to whether one marks the beginning or the end of an insertion.

em. Indicates that the preceding reading is an emendation. When the accepted text is an emendation which Jambūvijaya already made and adopted, the lemma sign is followed by 'em. Jambū.'

conj. Indicates that the preceding reading is a conjecture. When the accepted text is a conjecture which Jambūvijaya already made and adopted, the lemma sign is followed by 'conj. Jambū.'

The distinction between 'em.' and 'conj.' is one of degree, and thus subjective; cf. p. 54 above.

Policy with regard to 'accidentals,' variants which are not of substance, is the same as in the edition in Part I; see p. 53 above. In addition to the types of variation listed there, I have also not reported the use of *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmānīya* for *visarga* (exclusively, but not consistently, in the Śāradā manuscripts), nor differences in punctuation, i.e., use of *daṇḍa*s and half-*daṇḍa*s;[33] of course, if a variant reading is considered substantive it is given in the apparatus in the precise form found in the manuscript. In regard to the last point, it should be remarked that all the manuscripts so frequently punctuate in misleading or downright mistaken fashion, that it seems hardly possible to accord authority to any manuscript in this regard. The punctuation given, which aside from *daṇḍa*s also includes commas and dashes, is therefore purely editorial.[34] Nonetheless, in the occasional dubious passage, manuscript punctuation could be taken into account, as at least giving clues as to how a scribe, who at the same time was a reader of the text and probably a user of Sanskrit,[35] construed the text.

In reporting the readings chosen by Jambūvijaya the corrections in the *śuddhipatrakam* of the first edition have been taken into account.

To provide some further material for weighing the relation between J_1 and J_2, J_2 (including $J_2^{\acute{S}}$) has been included in the apparatus up to and including 1.1.6.

The lemmas given in the critical apparatus have sometimes been made rather longer than was strictly necessary; this was done with the consideration that the reader might thus more easily locate the variant in the text.

33 And, in the case of Jambūvijaya's edition, commas and dashes.

34 Be it remarked that in classical philology too experience is that none of the manuscripts—all of which, if we exclude papyrus fragments, date from many centuries after the composition of the text—can be regarded as preserving punctuation which reflects authorial usage.

35 I do not of course suggest that all scribes knew Sanskrit or bothered themselves about how to construe the text they copied, but I believe there are indications that this may have been the case with the scribes of the four (independant) manuscript witnesses to this text.

2.6 The textual commentary

Rather than an annotated translation, I append to the text a commentary which, while not extremely detailed, is intended to point out and discuss briefly all significant problems of text and interpretation. The text is on the whole far less problematic than Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, dealt with in the previous part: the language is simpler, the thought less convoluted and the textual transmission somewhat less defective. Moreover, parts of Candrānanda's commentary are already available in translation,[36] and the work is in the main clear enough, I believe, that with occasional help from the commentary the reader should encounter no great difficulties. A new, complete and annotated translation, based on the text of the new edition, is perhaps a desideratum, but not at the moment a very urgent one I think.

All places where I have accepted a different reading in the constituted text from that printed by Jambūvijaya have been discussed. So too have the places where I follow Jambūvijaya in an emendation or conjecture against all the manuscripts, except for some cases where the rationale of the correction should be immediately clear and convincing. In some passages where my understanding of the text differs significantly from that suggested by Nozawa's translation I have also added an explanation.[37]

The parallel passages occasionally adduced are in no sense a complete collection, nor are they intended as such. For the first two *adhyāyas* Nozawa has put together a quite impressive number of helpful parallel texts, and I have drawn gratefully on his labour. I have not however reproduced them all here, and at a few places I have added others. My commentary thus is intended in this regard to supplement rather than replace his notes on these *adhyāyas*.

Marginal numbers in bold-face refer to the sūtra numbering. Note that *avataraṇas* are reckoned as belonging to the sūtra they introduce.

36 See especially Nozawa 1993a, translating the first two *adhyāyas*, and Halbfass 1992, 238–246 (appendix 1), translating of the comentary on *adhyāya* 1 *āhnika* 2 and *adhyāya* 9 sūtras 1–12. Nozawa's M.A. thesis at the University of Madras contained an English translation of the entire commentary (personal communication; cf. Nozawa 1993a, 97b). This remains unpublished at present. In another unpublished M.A. thesis, I translated the commentary on 3.1.13, 3.2.1, 4.1.6–14, and the entire eighth *adhyāya* (Isaacson 1990, 15–25). Several individual passages, sometimes just a sentence or two, have been translated in various publications. I mention only the most extensive of these: Nozawa 1991, in addition to the commentary on 2.1.15–19 (which is also found translated in Nozawa 1993a) translates that on 3.2.6–14 as well.

37 Quite a few minor infelicities and inexactitudes of Nozawa's translation have been left unnoticed however.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must acknowledge my indebtedness to quite a number of individuals and institutions for help in gaining access to the manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary: Muni Jambūvijaya, Prof. A. Wezler, Mr. D. Goodall, Dr. Śītāṃśu Rath, and the libraries of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, the BORI, the Oriental Institute, Baroda, and the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain. Once again I owe a great deal to Mr. C. Nenninger, Dr. K. Preisendanz and Prof. A. Wezler for their extremely helpful criticism and suggestions made during meetings at the University of Hamburg, in the summer semester of 1994, at which we read a draft of my edition of the first *adhyāya*. I profited also from helpful comments made by Prof. Dr. T. Vetter, Dr. H. T. Bakker and Mr. Dominic Goodall. Finally, I realize fully how much I have benefited from having Muni Jambūvijaya's work before me—without it this edition would have been much more unsatisfactory than it now is.

वैशेषिकसूत्रम्।

चन्द्रानन्दविरचितवृत्तिसहितम्।

प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य प्रथममाह्निकम्।

अथातो धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः।१।१।१।

कस्यचिद्ब्राह्मणस्य वेदाभ्यासवशेन व्यपगतकल्मषस्येदं प्रतिवभौ। अशरीरं वाव सन्तं प्रियाप्रिये न स्पृशत इति। तत इदं वाक्यमालोच्य कणभक्षमाजगाम। ततोऽभ्युवाच। भगवन्ननेन वाक्येनापहतशरीरत्वस्य क्षेमसाधनता कथ्यते। तदुच्यतां क उपाय इति। ततो मुनिरभ्युवाच। धर्म इति। ततो जगाद ब्राह्मणः। को धर्मः कथंलक्षणः कान्यस्य साधनानि किंप्रयोजनः कांश्च प्रत्युपकरोतीति। अत एभ्यः प्रश्नेभ्यो ऽनन्तरं धर्मव्याख्यानप्रतिज्ञायामथशब्द आनन्तर्यमभिधत्ते। अतःशब्दोऽपि वैराग्यप्रज्ञाकषायपरिपाकादिकां शिष्यगुणसम्पदं हेतुत्वेनापदिशति। यस्मादयं शिष्यो गुणसम्पदा युक्तस्ततो ऽस्मै प्रश्नेभ्यो ऽनन्तरं धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः।

को धर्म इत्याह।

यतो ऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः।१।१।२।

1.1.1 व्याख्यास्यामः] J_1J_2Ś, व्याख्यामः $J_1^sJ_2^s$ 1.1.2 °निःश्रेयस°] Σ, °निःश्रेयस° J_2^s

---

2–3 अशरीरं ... स्पृशतः *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 8.12.1.

---

2 ब्राह्मणस्य] J_1J_2Ś$_2$Jambū., ब्रह्मणस्ये Ś$_1^{ac}$, ब्रह्मणस्य Ś$_1^{pc}$Ś$_3$ 2 °वशेन] Σ, °वशेने Ś$_3^{ac}$ 2 °स्येदं] Ś, °स्येदं वेदवाक्यं J_1J_2Jambū.   3 कणभक्षम्] J_1J_2Jambū., कणभक्षणम् Ś   4 भगवन्ननेन] Σ, भगवन्नेनेन Ś$_3^{ac}$ 4 वाक्येनापहत°] J_1J_2Jambū., वाक्येन व्यपहत° Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, वाक्येन व्यपगत° Ś$_3$ 4 °शरीरत्वस्य] conj., °शरीरस्य Σ   5 धर्म इति] J_1J_2Ś$_2$Jambū., धर्म इति Ś$_1$, धर्ममिति Ś$_3$ 6 किंप्रयोजनः] ŚJambū., किंप्रयोज(:) J_1^{ac} (*jihvāmūlīya?*), किंप्रयोजनं $J_1^{pc}J_2$ 6 कांश्च प्रत्युपकरोतीति। अत] J_1J_2Jambū., कश्च प्रत्युपकरोति इत्यतः Ś   7 ऽनन्तरं] Σ, नन्तरे Ś$_2$ 7 °शब्द आनन्तर्यम्] Σ, °शब्द(या)नंतर्यम् J_1 7 आनन्तर्यमभिधत्ते] J_1J_2Jambū., आनन्तर्यर्थमभिधत्ते Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, आनन्तर्यार्थमभिधत्ते Ś$_3$ 8 अतःशब्दो ऽपि] ŚJambū., अतःशब्दोपि। अतःशब्दोपि J_1J_2 8 °कषाय°] Ś, °कथा(य)° J_1, °कथा° $J_2J_1^{?c}$Jambū.   8 शिष्यगुणसम्पदं] J_1J_2Jambū., शिष्यगतसम्पदं Ś

यागदेवतापूजादिक्रियाणामाज्यपुष्पादिनिर्वर्त्यानां तदैव विनष्टत्वादुत्तरकालं फलदानाशक्तेर्यस्माद्धेतोरभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसे भवतः स धर्म इति वोद्धव्यः। अभ्युदयो ब्रह्मादिलोकेषु चेष्टशरीरप्राप्तिरनर्थोपरमश्च। निःश्रेयसमप्यात्मनो वैशेषिकगुणाभावरूपो मोक्षः।

कुत एवंलक्षणो धर्मो ज्ञायत इति चेत्। आम्नायात्। तस्य प्रामाण्यं कथमित्याह—

तद्वचनादाम्नायप्रामाण्यम्।१।१।३।

तदिति हिरण्यगर्भपरामर्शः। हिरण्यं रेतो ऽस्येति कृत्वा भगवान्महेश्वर एवोच्यते। आप्तेनोक्तत्वस्य सत्यताव्याप्तत्वादिहाप्तेन हिरण्यगर्भेणोक्तत्वादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यं साध्यते। ईश्वरश्च साधितस्तनुभुवनादीनां कार्यतया घटादिवद्बुद्धिमत्कर्तृकत्वानुमानेन।

उक्तं धर्मस्वरूपं तल्लक्षणं च। साधनान्यस्येदानीं द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि वक्ष्यामः। तत्र—

पृथिव्यापस्तेजो वायुराकाशं कालो दिगात्मा मन इति द्रव्याणि।१।१।४।

द्रव्यत्वाभिसम्वन्धाद्द्रव्याणि। पृथिवीत्वाभिसम्वन्धात्पृथिवी। एवमवादिसंज्ञाः। न-

---

1.1.3 °प्रामाण्यम्] Σ. °प्रामण्यं $Ś_1$ 1.1.4 पृथिव्यापस्तेजो] $J_1^{Spc}J_2J_2^{S}$Jambū., पृथिव्यापास्तेजो J_1^{Sac}, पृथिव्यातस्तेजो J_1, पृथिव्यातेजो $Ś_1^{ac}Ś_2$, पृथिव्यतेजो $Ś_1^{pc}Ś_3$

---

1 °पूजादि°] Σ. पूजाति° $Ś_3$ 1 °क्रियाणामाज्य°] ŚJambū., °क्रियाणामाज्या° J_1J_2 1 निर्वर्त्यानां] J_1J_2Jambū., निवर्त्यानां Ś   1 तदैव] $J_1J_2Ś_2$Jambū., क तदैव $Ś_1$, कदैव $Ś_3$ 1 विनष्टत्वाद्] Σ. निष्टत्वाद् $Ś_3$ 2 फलदानाशक्तेर्] ŚJambū., फलदानासक्तेर् J_1J_2 2 °निःश्रेयसे] J_1Jambū.. °निःस्रेयसे J_2. °निश्श्रेयसौ Ś   2 वोद्धव्यः] $Ś_3J_1J_2$Jambū., वोधव्यः $Ś_1Ś_2$ 3 °लोकेषु चेष्ट°] Ś, °लोकेष्विष्ट° J_1J_2Jambū.   3 निःश्रेयसमप्यात्मनो] Ś. निःश्रेयसमव्यात्मनो J_1J_2Jambū.   3 वैशेषिक°] J_1J_2Jambū., वैशेषिका° $Ś_1Ś_2Ś_3^{pc}$, वैशिषिका° $Ś_3^{ac}$ 5 प्रामाण्यं] Σ. प्रामाण्य $Ś_1$ 8 °परामर्शः] Σ. °प्रामाण्यपरामर्शः $Ś_2$ 8 ऽस्येति] Σ. स्यति $Ś_1$ 8 भगवान्] J_1J_2Jambū., श्रीभगवान् Ś   9 सत्यताव्याप्तत्वाद्] J_1J_2Jambū., सत्यव्याप्तत्वाद् $Ś_1^{pc}Ś_2$, सत्यव्याप्यत्वाद् $Ś_1^{ac}Ś_3$ 12 द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि] ŚJambū., द्रव्याणि J_1J_2 16 °सम्वन्धाद्द्रव्याणि] $Ś_1Ś_2$Jambū., °सम्वन्धत्वाद्द्रव्याणि $Ś_3$, °संबंधाद्रव्याणि J_1J_2 16 पृथिवीत्वा°… द्रव्याणि om. J_1J_2(eyeskip)   16 पृथिवीत्वाभिसम्वन्धात्] em. Jambū., पृथिवीत्वादिसम्वन्धात् $Ś_1Ś_2$. पृथिवीत्वादिसम्वन्धत्वात् $Ś_3$ 16 एवमवादि°] J_1J_2Jambū., एवमेव {एवं एव $Ś_1$} सर्वादि° Ś   16 °संज्ञाः] em., °संज्ञा Σ

वैव द्रव्याणि नाधिकानीत्येवमर्थमितिशब्दः।

एवमुद्दिष्टानि द्रव्याणि। के पुनर्गुणा इत्याह—

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शाः सङ्ख्याः परिमाणानि पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभागौ परत्वापरत्वे बुद्धयः सुखदुःखे इच्छाद्वेषौ प्रयत्नश्च गुणाः।१।१।५।

एते सप्तदश कण्ठोक्ता रूपादयो गुणाः। चशब्दसमुच्चिताश्च गुरुत्वद्रवत्वस्नेहसंस्काराधर्माधर्मशब्दा गृह्यन्ते। एते यथावसरमुत्तरत्र वक्ष्यन्ते।

कानि पुनः कर्माणीत्याह—

उत्क्षेपणमपक्षेपणमाकुञ्चनं प्रसारणं गमनमिति कर्माणि।१।१।६।

एतान्येव पञ्च कर्माणि द्रष्टव्यानि। गमनग्रहणाद्भ्रमणरेचनादीनां ग्रहणम्।

एवमुद्दिष्टानि द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि। तदनुषङ्गात्सामान्यविशेषसमवाया अपि वक्ष्यन्ते। एवं षण्णां पदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यपरिज्ञानं विषयदोषदर्शनद्वारेण वैराग्योत्पत्तौ सत्यां निःश्रेयसे साध्ये धर्महेतुः। अभ्युदये साध्ये धर्महेतुत्वं पुनरमीषां समे यजेतेति पृथिव्याः। अधो ऽम्बूनि नयतीत्यादि यथास्वमन्येषां द्रव्याणाम्। गुणानां तु कृष्णमालभेतेत्यादि। कर्मणां तु व्रीहीनवहन्तीत्यादि।

विज्ञातसाधर्म्यवैधर्म्याणां च द्रव्यादीनामभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसहेतुत्वात्साधर्म्यं

1.1.5 सङ्ख्याः] $J_1^S J_2^S$ Jambū., सङ्ख्या $J_1 J_2$Ś 1.1.5 परत्वापरत्वे] $J_1 J_2^S J_2$ Jambū., परत्वापरत्व Ś, परत्वे J_2^S 1.1.6 उत्क्षेपणमपक्षेपणम्] Ś, उत्क्षेपणमवक्षेपणम् $J_1^S J_2^S J_1 J_2$ Jambū.

---

15 समे यजेत Untraced.
15 अधो ऽम्बूनि नयति Untraced.
16 कृष्णमालभेत Untraced.
16 व्रीहीनवहन्ति Untraced; cf. Edgerton 1929, 29.

---

1 नाधिकानी°] ŚJ_1^{pc}Jambū., नाधिका+नी+(री)° J_1, नाधिकानीरी° J_2 6 गुरुत्वद्रवत्व°] $J_1 J_2$Jambū., गुरुत्वद्रवत्वे $Ś_1 Ś_2$, गुरुद्रवत्वे $Ś_3$ 11 एतान्येव … द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि] om. J_2 12 तदनुषङ्गात्] ŚJambū., तदनुषङ्गत् $J_1 J_2$ 14 अभ्युदये] em. Jambū., अभ्युदय $J_1 J_2$, अभ्युपगमे Ś 15 पृथिव्याः। अधो ऽम्बूनि] conj. Jambū., पृथिव्याः। अधोंबूनि $J_1 J_2$, पृथिव्या अधोवनि $Ś_1 Ś_2$, पृथिव्याधोवनि $Ś_3$ 15 यथास्वम्] Σ, स्वम् $Ś_3$ 16 तु] Σ, om. J_2 16 कृष्णमालभेते°] J_1Jambū., कृष्णमाल-ते° $Ś_1$, कृष्णमालभ्येते° $Ś_2$, कृष्णमालम्बेते° $Ś_3$, कृष्णमालभते° J_2 17 विज्ञात°] $J_1 J_2$Jambū., निज्ञात° $Ś_1 Ś_2$, निज्ञात $Ś_3$ (sic)

तावत्कथयति—

सदनित्यं द्रव्यवत्कार्यं कारणं सामान्यविशेषवदिति द्रव्यगुण-कर्मणामविशेषः।१।१।७।

सद्द्रव्यं सन्गुणः सत्कर्मेति सत्ता त्रयाणामविशेषः। तथैवानित्यत्वमन्यत्राकाशादिभ्यः। द्रव्यवदिति समवायिकारणवत्त्वमविशेषः परमाण्वाकाशादिवर्जम्। कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भवनं तथैवाविशेषो ऽन्यत्र नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः। कारणत्वं कार्यजनकत्वं त्रयाणामविशेषः। क्षित्यादीनि द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समवायिकारणमाकाशादीनि गुणानां मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये गुणकर्मणाम्। गुणास्तु रूपरसगन्धानुष्णस्पर्शसङ्ख्यापरिमाणैकपृथक्त्वस्नेहशब्दा असमवायिकारणं बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्माधर्मभावना निमित्तकारणं संयोगविभागौष्ण्यगुरुत्वद्रवत्ववेगा उभयथा कारणम्। परत्वापरत्वद्वित्वद्विपृथक्त्वपारिमाण्डल्यादयो ऽकारणम्। कर्माणि संयोगविभागेष्वसमवायिकारणम्। सामान्यानि च तानि द्रव्यत्वादीनि विशेषाश्च त इति सामान्यविशेषाः। तद्वत्ता त्रयाणामविशेषः।

त्रयाणामेकत्वे प्राप्ते वैधर्म्यमुच्यते। तथा हि—

द्रव्याणि द्रव्यान्तरमारभन्ते।१।१।८।

द्रव्ये च द्रव्याणि चेति विग्रहादेकमनारम्भकम्। समवायिकारणानि द्रव्याणि स्वा-

1.1.7 द्रव्यगुणकर्मणामविशेषः] $J_1 J_1^{s}$ Jambū., द्रव्यगुणं कर्मणां सविशेषः Ś$_1$, द्रव्यगुणं कर्मणामविशेषः Ś$_2$, द्रव्यगुणकर्माणां सविशेषस् Ś$_3$

4 सद्द्रव्यं … त्रयाणामविशेषः] om. Ś   4 सद्द्रव्यं] em. Jambū., सद्रव्यं J_1 5 समवायिकारणवत्त्वमविशेषः] Σ, समवायकारणवत्त्वसविशेषः Ś$_3$ 5 परमाण्वाकाशादिवर्जम्] Σ, परमाण्वा(दि)काशा÷दि÷वर्ज्जं J_1 (added दि sec. man.)   6 कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भवनं] J_1Jambū., कार्यत्वमभावने Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भावनं Ś$_2$ 6 नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः] J_1Jambū., हि नित्यद्रवेभ्यः Ś$_1$, हि नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः Ś$_3$, हिद्यद्रवेभ्यः Ś$_2$ 7 कारणत्वं कार्यजनकत्वं] J_1Jambū., कार्यत्वे कार्यजनकत्वे Ś   7 °काशादीनि] Σ, °काशादीन Ś$_3^{ac}$ 8 गुणास्तु] Σ, गुणोस्तु J_1 9 °प्रयत्न°] J_1Jambū., om. Ś   10 °भावना] Ś$_3$$J_1$Jambū., °भाविना Ś$_1$, °भाविहा Ś$_2$ 10 °द्रवत्ववेगा उभयथा] J_1Jambū., °द्रव्यत्ववेगा उभयथा Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, °द्रव्यत्वयोगेनोभयथा Ś$_3$ 10 कारणम्] Σ, करणम् Ś$_1$ 11 °पारिमाण्डल्यादयो] em. Jambū., °पारिमण्डल्यादयो Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, °पारिमण्डल्यादयः Ś$_3$, °पारिमंडल्यादयो J_1 12 द्रव्यत्वादीनि] J_1Jambū., द्रव्यादीनि Ś   12 त इति] J_1Jambū., ते इति Ś   13 तद्वत्ता त्रयाणाम्] Ś$_2$$J_1$Jambū., तद्वत्तत्रयाणाम् Ś$_1$, तद्वत्त्रयाणाम् Ś$_3$ 14 त्रयाणामेकत्वे प्राप्ते वैधर्म्यम्] J_1 (°र्म्याम् J_1^{ac}) Jambū., त्रयाणामेकत्वप्राप्तेस्साधर्म्यम् Ś (°प्राप्तेः Ś$_3$)   14 वैधर्म्यम्] Σ, वैधर्म्याम् J_1^{ac}

त्मव्यतिरिक्तं कार्यद्रव्यमारभन्ते। आकाशाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि तु द्रव्यं नारभन्ते तुल्यजातीयानां मूर्तिक्रियारूपादिमतां द्वयोर्बहूनां वा कारणानां कार्यारम्भकत्वात्। न चैवंविधान्याकाशादीनि। मनसो ऽस्पर्शवत्त्वाद्द्रव्याकारणत्वमन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणां चादृष्टत्वात्।

गुणाश्च गुणान्तरम्।१।१।९।

गुणौ च गुणाश्चेति पूर्ववत्। यथा तन्तुरूपादयः स्वाश्रयसमवेते पटद्रव्ये रूपादिगुणानात्मव्यतिरिक्तानारभन्ते।

कर्म कर्मसाध्यं न विद्यते।१।१।१०।

न कर्मणा कर्म जन्येत कर्मणामुपरमदर्शनात्। कर्मारम्भे हि कर्मणां निष्कर्मणो द्रव्यस्यानुपलम्भः स्यात्।

एवं कानिचिद्द्रव्याण्यारम्भकानि कानिचिन्नैव। गुणाः केचित्कारणं केचिन्नैव। कर्माणि नैव कर्मकारणमित्येतद्वैधर्म्यम्।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमाह—

कार्याविरोधि द्रव्यं कारणाविरोधि च।१।१।११।

विनाशो विरोधः, प्रतिवन्धः क्वचित्। द्रव्यादिना कार्येण कारणद्रव्यं समवाय्यसमवायिकारणाभ्यां च न विरुध्यते। तथा द्व्यङ्गुलिद्रव्यं कार्यं द्व्यङ्गुलं जनयिष्यत्तदर्थेन

1.1.11 कार्याविरोधि] ŚJ$_1^{Spc}$Jambū., कार्याविरोधे J$_1^{Sac}$J$_1$ 1.1.11 कारणाविरोधि च] J$_1^{Spc}$Jambū., कारणाविरोधे च J$_1^{Sac}$, कारणविरोधे वा J$_1$, कारणविरोधि Ś

---

1 °व्यतिरिक्तं] Σ, °व्यतिरिक्ते Ś$_2$ 1 कार्यद्रव्यमारभन्ते] (तुल्यजातीयानां) add. Ś$_2$ 1 आकाशाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि] J$_1$Jambū., आकाशान्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि Ś$_1$, आकाशान्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि Ś$_2$, आकाशान्त्यवयविद्रव्याणि Ś$_3$ 1 तु द्रव्यं] J$_1$Jambū., द्रव्यं तु Ś$_1$Ś$_3^{pc}$, द्रव्ये तु Ś$_2$Ś$_3^{ac}$ 2 मूर्ति°] Σ, मुक्ति° J$_1$ 2 द्वयोर्बहूनां] Σ, द्वयोवहूनाण् J$_1$ 3 °विधान्याकाश°] Σ, °विधान्यकाशा° Ś$_3$ 3 °त्त्वाद्द्रव्या°] Σ, °त्वाद्रव्या° J$_1$ 4 चादृष्टत्वात्] J$_1$Jambū., च दृष्टत्वात् Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, च दृष्टत्वात् Ś$_3$ 6 तन्तु°] Σ, तंतु° J$_1$ 7 रूपादिगुणानात्मव्यतिरिक्तानारभन्ते] J$_1$Jambū., रूपादिगुणावात्मव्यतिरिक्तावारभन्ते Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, रूपादिगुणावात्मव्यतिरिक्तौ आरभन्ते Ś$_2$ 9 कर्मणा] Σ, कर्मणो J$_1$ 9 जन्येत] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$, जन्येन Ś$_3$, जन्यते J$_1$Jambū. 9 कर्मणां] Σ, कर्माणां J$_1$ 10 °लम्भः स्यात्] Σ, °लम्भात् J$_1$ 11 एवं] J$_1$, एवं च ŚJambū. 11 कानिचिद्द्रव्याण्यारम्भकानि] Σ, कानिचित् द्रव्याणारंभकानि J$_1$ 15 द्रव्यादिना कार्येण] J$_1$Jambū., द्रव्यादिकार्येण Ś 16 समवाय्यसमवायि°] Σ, समवायि असमवायि° J$_1$ 16 च] J$_1$Jambū., om. Ś 16 जनयिष्यत्तदर्थेन] Ś$_1$Ś$_3$Jambū., जनयिष्यनुदर्थेन Ś$_2$, जनयिष्यं तदर्थेन J$_1$

कर्मणा तत्कृतेन संयोगेन ततो जातेन द्व्यङ्गुलेन न विरुध्यते नापि समवाय्यसमवायिकारणाभ्यां पर्वततत्संयोगाभ्यां वा। मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि गुणकर्मभिः कार्यैराकाशादीनि गुणैर्नित्यत्वादेषां न कारणविरोधः।

उभयथा गुणः।१।१।१२।

कार्यकारणोभयानुभयैरविरोधी विरोधी च। परमाणुद्व्यणुकाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्येषु रूपादयः कार्योभयकारणैरविरोधिनो यथासम्भवम्। रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा अकार्यकारणभूता अविरोधिनः परस्परेण।विरोधिन आद्यमध्यान्त्यशब्दाः कार्योभयकारणैः, अदृष्टः कार्येण, स्पर्शवद्द्रव्यसंयोगेन वेगप्रयत्नौ, संयोगविभागौ सुखदुःखे इच्छाद्वेषौ परस्परतो ऽकार्यकारणभूतौ विरुध्येते ज्ञानं संस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः संस्कारो ज्ञानमदढुःखादिभिरिति यथासम्भवमेतद्द्रष्टव्यम्।

कार्यविरोधि कर्म।१।१।१३।

संयोगविभागसंस्काराणां कार्याणां मध्यात्संयोगेनैव कर्म विरुध्यते न विभागसंस्काराभ्यां संयोगानुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात्।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमपि—

1.1.13 कार्यविरोधि] ŚJ$_1^{pc}$Jambū., कार्यविरोधे J$_1^{ac}$J$_1$

---

1 कर्मणा] Σ. कर्मणो J$_1$　1 जातेन] Σ. जातोन Ś$_2$　2 पर्वतत्संयोगाभ्यां] em. Jambū., पर्वतः संयोगाभ्यां J$_1$, पूर्ववत्संयोगाभ्यां Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, पूर्ववंत्सयोगाभ्यां Ś$_2$　2 मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि] J$_1$Jambū., मनोन्त्यावयवोद्रव्याणि Ś　5 ॰नुभयैरविरोधी] J$_1$Jambū., ॰नुभयो विरोधी Ś　6 ॰द्व्यणुकाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्येषु रूपादयः] J$_1$Jambū., ॰द्व्य(नु)णुकान्त्यावयविद्रव्येष्वरूपादयः Ś$_1$, ॰द्व्यणुकान्त्यावयविद्रव्ये स्वरूपादयः Ś$_2$Ś$_3$　6 ॰न्त्यावयवि॰] Σ, ॰न्त्यवयवि॰ J$_1^{ac}$　6 रूपादयः] Σ. रूपाद+यः+ J$_1$　6 कार्योभयकारणैरविरोधिनो] em. Jambū., कारणैरविरोधिनो J$_1$, कार्योभयकारणैर्विरोधिनो Ś　7 ॰स्पर्शा अकार्य॰] J$_1$Jambū., ॰स्पर्शा आकार्य॰ Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, ॰स्पर्शाकार्य॰ Ś$_2$ (unclear mark under the आ of र्शा)　7 अविरोधिनः] Σ, अविरोधेनः J$_1$　7 परस्परेण। विरोधिन] em.Jambū., परस्परेण विरोधेन J$_1$, परस्परेणाविरोधिनः Ś　7 आद्यमध्यान्त्य] J$_1$Jambū., आद्याख्यान्त्य॰ Ś　8 ॰कारणैः] Σ. ॰कारणोः J$_1$　8 अदृष्टः कार्येण] Σ. अदृष्टकार्येण Ś$_2$　9 परस्परतो ऽकार्य॰] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., परस्परतः कार्य॰ Ś$_3$J$_1^{pc}$　9 ॰कारणभूतौ] Σ. ॰करणभूतौ Ś$_2$　9 विरुध्येते] Σ. विरुद्ध्येते J$_1$　9 ज्ञानं संस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः] J$_1$Jambū., ज्ञानसंस्कारसत्तान्नप्रतिपक्षैः Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, ज्ञानसंस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः Ś$_2$　10 ज्ञानमदढुःखा॰] Σ. ज्ञानसु(ख)ढुःखा॰ Ś$_3$ (doubtful syllable could also be । (ब्द))　12 कार्याणां मध्यात्संयोगेनैव] J$_1$Jambū., कार्याणामध्यात्मयोगेनैव Ś　13 ॰संस्काराभ्यां संयोगानुत्पत्ति॰] J$_1$Jambū., ॰संस्काराभ्याम{॰भ्यांम॰ Ś$_2$}नुत्पत्ति॰ Ś

क्रियावद्गुणवत्समवायिकारणमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम्।१।१।१४।

उत्क्षेपणादिकं कर्म क्रिया यथासम्भवं यस्मिन्यत्समवायेन वर्तते तत्क्रियावदन्यत्राकाशकालदिगात्मभ्यः। गुणा रूपादयो यत्र यथासम्भवं वर्तन्ते तद्गुणवत्। अयुतसिद्धानामाधार्याधारभूतानामिहेति यतः स समवायः, स यस्यास्ति तत्समवायि कारणं च तदेव, समवायिनो वा, कार्यस्य कारणम्। तत्र क्षित्यादीनि त्रयाणां द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समवायिकारणमाकाशादीनि गुणानां मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये गुणकर्मणाम्।

द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान्संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इति गुणलक्षणम्।१।१।१५।

द्रव्यमाश्रयतीति द्रव्याश्रयी। अगुणवान्निर्गुणः। संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इति सापेक्षः कारणम्। तथा हि—अङ्गुल्योराकाशसंयोगो द्व्यङ्गुलाकाशसंयोगे कर्तव्ये द्व्यङ्गुलोत्पत्तिमपेक्षते अङ्गुल्योः परस्परविभागो द्व्यङ्गुलाकाशविभागं प्रति कार्यविनाशमपेक्षते। एवं संयोगविभागलक्षण एव गुणः संयोगविभागेषु सापेक्षः कारणम्।

एकद्रव्यमगुणं संयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षं कारणमिति कर्मलक्षणम्।१।१।१६।

एकमस्य कर्मणो द्रव्यमाश्रयो न द्वे, एकमेव वा द्रव्ये वर्तत इत्येकद्रव्यम्। नास्य

1.1.15 द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान्] Ś$_1$J$_1$J$_1^s$Jambū., द्रव्याश्रयगुणवान् Ś$_2$Ś$_3$　1.1.16 कर्मलक्षणम्] Σ, कल्पलक्षणं J$_1$

---

2 °वायेन] Σ, °वेयेन Ś$_3^{ac}$　2 वर्तते तत्क्रियावद्] Σ, वर्तते (possibly वर्तेत) इति क्रियावत् Ś$_3$　3 काशकालदिगात्मभ्यः] Ś$_1^{pc}$Jambū., °काशकालादिगात्मभ्यः J$_1^{ac}$, °कालकाला{°ला° Ś$_2$}दिगादिभ्यः Ś　3 गुणा] Ś$_1$J$_1$Jambū., गुण Ś$_2$Ś$_3$　3 यत्र] Σ, added i.m. Ś$_3$　3 यथासम्भवं] Σ, +यथा+संभवं J$_1$　3 वर्तन्ते] J$_1$Jambū., वर्तते Ś (Ś$_3$ blotched, conceivably corrected from वर्तन्ते)　4 स समवायः] Ś$_2$, समवायः J$_1$Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, [स] समवायः Jambū.　5 कारणं] Ś$_2$J$_1$Jambū., कारणे Ś$_1$Ś$_3$　5 तदेव समवायिनो] Ś$_1$Ś$_3$Jambū., तदैव समवायिनो J$_1$, तदेवासमवायिनो Ś$_2$　6 द्रव्य°] Σ, om. Ś$_3$　11 सापेक्षः] Σ, सापेक्ष J$_1$　11 तथा हि अङ्गुल्योर्] J$_1$Jambū., तथाङ्गुल्योर् Ś　12 °संयोगो द्व्यङ्गुलाकाशसंयोगे कर्तव्ये] J$_1$Jambū., °संयोगे द्व्यङ्गुलाकारे Ś　12 °त्पत्तिमपेक्षते] Σ, °त्पत्तिमपेक्षेते J$_1$　12 अङ्गुल्योः ... °पेक्षते] Σ, om. Ś$_3$　12 अङ्गुल्योः] Ś$_2$J$_1$Jambū., अङ्गुल्यो Ś$_1$　12 °विभागो] Ś$_2$J$_1$Jambū., °विभागे Ś$_1$　13 °विनाशमपेक्षते] Ś$_1$Jambū., °विनासमपेक्षते J$_1$ °विनाशमपेक्षेते Ś$_2$　13 संयोगविभागलक्षण] Σ, संयोगविभाग Ś$_3$　17 एकमस्य] J$_1$Jambū., एकस्य Ś　17 वा द्रव्ये] Σ, नाद्रव्ये J$_1$

गुणाः सन्तीत्यगुणम्। संयोगविभागेषु कार्येषु स्वस्याश्रयस्यान्यतो विभज्याश्रयान्तरेण संयोजनादुत्पाद्यविनाश्यानपेक्षया संयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षं कारणमिति।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमपि—

द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां द्रव्यं कारणं सामान्यम्।१।१।१७।

सामान्यशब्दः समानपर्यायः। क्षित्यादीनि त्रयाणां कारणं समानम्। आकाशादीनां केवलगुणकारणत्वेऽप्येकैकस्यानेकगुणत्वादाकाशादीनि समानं गुणेषु कारणम्। मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये गुणकर्मणाम्।

तथा गुणः।१।१।१८।

संयोगानां द्रव्यमित्यग्निसंयोगाद्गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावादित्यात्मसंयोगप्रयत्नाभ्यां हस्ते कर्मेति वाक्येभ्यः संयोग एव द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समानं कारणं नान्यो गुणः। तथा हि तूलपिण्डस्य वेगवता तूलेन संयोगात्कर्म द्वितूलकद्रव्यं तत्र च परिमाणं महदुत्पद्यते। अन्ये गुणा यथायोगम्।

संयोगविभागानां कर्म।१।१।१९।

स्वाश्रयमन्यतो विभज्याश्रयान्तरेण संयोजयत्यतः संयोगविभागानां समानं कारणं कर्म।

न द्रव्याणां व्यतिरेकात्।१।१।२०।

1.1.17 द्रव्यं] $Ś_2J_1J_1^{s}$, द्रव्य $Ś_1Ś_3$ 1.1.19 संयोग°] Σ, योग° $Ś_2$

---

9 संयोगानां द्रव्यम् VS 1.1.25.

9 अग्निसंयोगाद्गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावाद् Reference to VS 7.1.5-6 अग्निसंयोगाच्च। ७। १। ५। गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावात्।७।१।६।

10 आत्मसंयोगप्रयत्नाभ्यां हस्ते कर्म VS 5.1.1.

---

1 गुणाः सन्तीत्यगुणम्] J_1Jambū., गुणास्सन्त्यस्यागुणम् $Ś_1$, गुणस्सन्त्यस्यागुणम् $Ś_2$, गुणाः सन्त्यस्यागुणं $Ś_3$ 1 स्वस्याश्रयस्यान्यतो] J_1Jambū., स्वाश्रयतो $Ś_1$, स्वस्याश्रयतो $Ś_2Ś_3$ 2 °दुत्पाद्यविनाश्या°] Σ, °दुत्पाद्याविनास्या° J_1 5 क्षित्यादीनि] ŚJambū., क्षित्या।दीनि J_1^{ac}, क्षित्या।दीनां J_1^{pc} 6 °कैकस्यानेक°] Σ, °कैकस्यनेक° $Ś_1$ 6 °गुणत्वादाकाशादीनि] Σ, °गुणत्वाकाशादीनि J_1 6 समानं गुणेषु] J_1Jambū., समानगुणेषु Ś 7 °कर्मणाम्] $Ś_2J_1$Jambū., °कर्मकाणाम् $Ś_1Ś_3$ 11 वेगवता] J_1Jambū., वेगवत्ता Ś 11 तूलेन] Σ, तूलने J_1 12 महदुत्पद्यते] J_1Jambū., महानुत्पद्यते Ś 14 स्वाश्रयमन्यतो] J_1Jambū., स्वाश्रयमस्य यतो $Ś_1Ś_2$, स्वाश्रयस्य यतो $Ś_3$

यदि खलु द्रव्यस्य कारणं कर्म भवेत्तथा सति कृत्वापि संयोगं न निवर्तेत। निवृत्ते तु कर्मणि केवलस्य संयोगस्योपलम्भान्मन्यामहे न द्रव्यकारणं कर्म।

गुणवैधर्म्यान्न कर्मणाम्।१।१।२१।

गुरुत्वद्रवत्वनोदनाभिघातसंयुक्तसंयोगाः स्वाश्रये पराश्रये च कर्मकारणं प्रयत्नादृष्टौ तु पराश्रय एव। तत्र न तावत्कर्म स्वाश्रये कर्मकारणं, निष्क्रियद्रव्यानुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गात्। नापि पराश्रये तत्संयोगेनैव निवर्तितत्वात्। तस्मादेतैः कर्मकारणैर्गुणैर्वैधर्म्यान्न कर्म कर्मकारणम्।

अपरं वैधर्म्यम्—

द्रव्याणां द्रव्यं कार्यं सामान्यम्।१।१।२२।

सजातीयानां द्वयोर्बहूनां वा द्रव्याणां द्रव्यं तन्तूनामिव पटः समानं कार्यम्।

द्वित्वप्रभृतयश्च सङ्ख्याः पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभागाश्च।१।१।२३।

द्वयोर्द्रव्ययोर्द्वित्वं सामान्यं कार्यं त्रयाणां त्रित्वमित्यादि। तथैव द्विपृथक्त्वादि। द्वयोर्द्रव्ययोः संयुज्यमानयोः संयोगो विभज्यमानयोर्विभागः। एषामनेकाश्रितत्वात्समानत्वम्।

असमवायात्सामान्यं कर्म कार्यं न विद्यते।१।१।२४।

अनेकस्मिन्द्रव्य एकस्य कर्मणः समवायनिषेधान्न द्रव्याणां द्विबहूनां कर्म समानं कार्यमस्ति।

1.1.21 गुणवैधर्म्यान्न] Σ, गुणवैधर्म्मान्न J_1^s 1.1.23 सङ्ख्याः] J_1^sJambū., सङ्ख्या J_1Ś 1.1.23 संयोगविभागाश्च] ŚJambū., संयोगाविभागाश्च J_1^s, संयोगविभागाश्च J_1 1.1.24 कर्म कार्यं] Σ, कार्यं कर्म्म J_1^s

---

1 भवेत्तथा] Σ, भवेत्तया Ś$_2$ 1 संयोगं न] J_1Jambū., संयोगेन Ś 1 निवर्तेत] Σ, निवर्त्तें+त+ J_1 2 तु] J_1Jambū., om. Ś 4 °द्रवत्वनोदना°] J_1Jambū., °द्रव्यत्वनोदना° Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, °द्रव्यत्वोनदना° Ś$_2$ 4 °संयोगाः स्वाश्रये] Ś$_2$$J_1$Jambū., °संयोगात्स्वाश्रये Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 5 तत्र न] conj., तत्र J_1ŚJambū. 5 स्वाश्रये] Σ, [न] स्वाश्रये Jambū. (conj.) 7 कर्मकारणम्] J_1Jambū., कर्मकारणम् Ś 10 वा] Σ, om. J_1 10 तन्तूनामिव] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Ś$_3^{pc}$Jambū., तन्तूनां व Ś$_3^{ac}$, तन्तूनामिवः J_1 10 द्रव्यं] Σ, om. Ś$_1$Ś$_2$ 13 संयुज्यमानयोः] J_1Jambū., संयोज्यमानयोः {°योः Ś$_1$} Ś 13 द्रव्ययोः] Σ, द्रव्ययो J_1 13 विभज्यमानयोर्] Σ, विभज्यामानयोर् J_1^{ac} 13 एषाम्] Σ, एषम् J_1 16 अनेकस्मिन्द्रव्य] Σ, अनेकस्मि+न्+द्रव्ये J_1 16 °निषेधान्न द्रव्याणां] J_1Jambū., °निषेधाद्द्रव्याणां Ś

संयोगानां द्रव्यम् ।१।१।२५।

द्वयोर्बहूनां वासमवायिकारणानां संयोगानां द्रव्यं समानं कार्यं तन्तुसंयोगानामिव पटः।

रूपाणां रूपम् ।१।१।२६।

द्वयोर्बहूनां वा कारणरूपाणां कार्यद्रव्याश्रितं रूपं समानं कार्यं यथा घटरूपं कपालरूपाणाम्। एवं रसादीनाम्।

गुरुत्वप्रयत्नसंयोगानामुत्क्षेपणम् ।१।१।२७।

आदित्यरश्मीनामगुरुत्वात्पर्वतस्य तथाभूतप्रयत्नाभावाल्लोष्टस्य च हस्तेनासंयुक्तत्वादनुत्क्षेपणमिति गुरुत्वादीनामुत्क्षेपणं समानं कार्यम्।

संयोगविभागाः कर्मणाम् ।१।१।२८।

उभयकर्मजा ये संयोगा विभागाश्च ते कर्मणां समानं कार्यम्।

कारणसामान्ये द्रव्यकर्मणां कर्माकारणमुक्तम् ।१।१।२९।

यस्मिन्प्रकरणे द्रव्यादीनां कारणं समानं वर्णितं तस्मिन्कारणसामान्ये द्रव्यकर्मणां यतः कर्माकारणमुक्तमतस्तान्यप्यस्य कार्यं सामान्यं न भवन्तीति। एवं नाना द्रव्यगुणकर्माणीति सिद्धम्।

॥ प्रथमस्याध्यायस्याद्यमाह्निकम् ॥

1.1.27 °संयोगानामुत्क्षेपणम्] $Ś_2Ś_3^{pc}$Jambū., °संयोगानामुत्क्षेपनं J_1, °संयोगा{°ग $Ś_1^{ac}$}नामत्क्षेपणम् $Ś_1$, °संयोगानामुत्क्षेपणां $Ś_3^{ac}$ 1.1.28 संयोगविभागाः] Σ, संयोगविभागः $Ś_1$ 1.1.28 कर्मणाम्] Σ, कर्माणां J_1^{ac} 1.1.28 °विभागाः कर्मणाम्] Σ, °विभागात्कर्मणाम् J_1^s 1.1.29 कारणसामान्ये] $J_1J_1^s$Jambū., कारणसामान्यैर् Ś 1.1.29 द्रव्यकर्मणां] ⟨कर्म्मणां⟩ add. J_1^s 1.1.29 कर्माकारणमुक्तम्] em., कर्माकारणमुक्तमिति J_1ŚJambū.

---

5 द्वयोर्] Σ, द्वयो J_1 6 कपाल°] J_1Jambū., कल्यापाल° $Ś_1Ś_2$, कन्यापाल° $Ś_3$ 8 पर्वतस्य] conj., पर्वते Σ! 9 °नुत्क्षेपणमिति] conj. Jambū., °नुत्क्षेपणासति J_1, °नुत्क्षेपणे सति Ś 9 गुरुत्वादीनाम्] $Ś_3J_1$Jambū., गुरुत्वादीनांम् $Ś_1Ś_2$ 11 ते] J_1Jambū., भेद Ś 13 प्रकरणे] Σ, प्रकरण{°णं?} J_1 14 कार्यं] J_1Jambū., कार्य Ś

प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयमाह्निकम्।

कार्यकारणशब्दौ पूर्वमुक्तौ। तन्निरूपणार्थमाह—

कारणाभावात्कार्याभावः।१।२।१।

यस्याभावात्तन्त्वादेः समवायिकारणस्य तत्संयोगानां वासमवायिकारणानां कार्यद्रव्यं न जायते पटादि, विनाशे वा विनश्यति, तत्कारणमन्यत्कार्यम्।

न तु कार्याभावात्कारणाभावः।१।२।२।

न पुनः पटादेरनुत्पत्तौ द्रव्यस्य तन्तूनां तत्संयोगानां वानुत्पत्तिः।

उक्ता आनुषङ्गिकाः सामान्यादयस्त्रयः पदार्थाः। तत्र सामान्यं कथयति—

सामान्यं विशेष इति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम्।१।२।३।

भिन्नेषु पिण्डेष्वनुवर्तमानां गौर्गौरिति बुद्धिमपेक्ष्य एभ्य एव च परस्परतो व्यावर्तमानामयमस्मादन्य इति तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षं सामान्यं व्यावृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षो विशेष इति।

भावः सामान्यमेव।१।२।४।

भावः सत्ता सामान्यमेव, त्रिष्वपि द्रव्यादिष्वनुवर्तमानत्वात्, न विशेषः।

द्रव्यत्वं गुणत्वं कर्मत्वं च सामान्यानि विशेषाश्च।१।२।५।

1.2.1 कार्याभावः] $J_1^{Spc}J_1^{Fpc}$Ś$_2$Ś$_3$Jambū., कार्यभावः $J_1^{Sac}J_1^{Fac}$Ś$_2^{ac}$, कर्याभावः Ś$_1$ 1.2.2 कारणाभावः] Σ, कारणोभावः J$_1$ 1.2.5 विशेषाश्च] J_1^SJ$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., विशेषश्च Ś$_1$Ś$_3$

---

1 कार्यकारणशब्दौ पूर्वमुक्तौ। तन्निरूपणार्थमाह] placed after 1.2.1 in all manuscripts and in Jambūvijaya's edition. The transposition was proposed by Nozawa (1993, 113a n. 55). 3 यस्याभावात्तन्त्वादेः] Σ, तस्य भावात्तत्वादेस् J$_1$ 3 °कारणस्य तत्संयोगानां] Σ, °कारणस्यात्संयोगानां J$_1$ 4 न] Σ, om. Ś$_3$ 4 विनाशे वा विनश्यति] Σ, विनासे वा विनश्यति J$_1$ 7 आनुषङ्गिकाः] Σ, अनुषंगिकाः J$_1$ 7 सामान्यादयस्त्रयः] J$_1$Jambū., सामान्यादयः Ś 9 °नुवर्तमानां] J$_1$Jambū., °नुवर्तमानानां Ś 9 बुद्धिम्] Σ, बुद्ध्यन् J_1^{ac} 10 व्यावर्तमानामयमस्मादन्य] conj. Jambū., व्यावर्तमानानामयमस्मादन्य J$_1$Ś$_2$, व्यावर्तमानानां यदस्मादन्य Ś$_3$, व्यावर्तमानननामयदस्मादन्य Ś$_1$ 10 तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षं] J$_1$Jambū., तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्ष Ś$_1$, तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्ष Ś$_2$Ś$_3$ 13 सत्ता] Σ, सत्ता Ś$_2$ 13 त्रिष्वपि] Σ, त्रिष्वपि Ś$_1$

क्षित्यादिषु यतो द्रव्यं द्रव्यमित्यनुवृत्तिवुद्धी रूपादिषु च गुणो गुण इत्युत्क्षेपणादिषु कर्म कर्मेति तानि द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वानि सामान्यानि परस्परतश्च व्यावृतेर्विशेषाः।

अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो विशेषेभ्यः।१।२।६।

नित्यद्रव्येषु परमाण्वाकाशादिषु समवायेन वर्तमानास्तुल्याकृतिगुणेष्वयमन्यो ऽयमन्य इत्यत्यन्तव्यावृत्तिबुद्धिहेतवस्तद्दर्शिनां विशेषकत्वाद्विशेषाः। एवं विशेषा व्याख्याताः।

सत्ता तु—

सदिति यतो द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु।१।२।७।

भिन्नेषु द्रव्यादिषु त्रिषु यतो जायते सत्सदिति वुद्धिः सा सत्ता।

आश्रयविनाशादस्या विनाश इति चेत्—न, यतः—

द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो ऽर्थान्तरं सत्ता।१।२।८।

यस्माद्द्रव्यादिभ्यो व्यतिरिक्ता सत्ता तस्मान्न द्रव्यादिविनाशे सत्ता विनश्यतीति।

द्रव्यादिव्यतिरेके युक्तिः—

एकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यम्।१।२।९।

द्रव्यमद्रव्यं परमाण्वाकाशादि कारणद्रव्याभावात्, अनेकद्रव्यं वा घटादि सम-

---

1.2.6 अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो] J_1^{Spc}Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., अन्यत्रान्तेभ्यो J_1^{Sac}Ś$_3$, अन्यत्रान्नेभ्यो J_1^{ac}, अन्यत्रान्न्येभ्यो J_1^{pc} 1.2.7 यतो] $J_1^S J_1$Jambū., om. Ś 1.2.9 एकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यम्] Σ, न द्रव्यमेकद्रव्यवत्वात् J_1^S

---

1 द्रव्यं] Σ, om. Ś$_2$ 1 °नुवृत्तिवुद्धी] Σ, °नुवृत्तवुद्धी J_1 2 कर्म] Σ, कर्मे Ś$_3^{ac}$ 2 °कर्मत्वानि] J_1Ś$_2$Jambū., °कर्मकत्वानि Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 3 व्यावृत्तेर्विशेषाः] em. Jambū., व्यावृत्तेर्विशेषः J_1, व्यावृत्तेश्च विशेषः Ś$_1$Ś$_3$, व्यावृत्तेश्च विशेषाः Ś$_2$ 6 इत्यत्यन्त°] Σ, इत्यन्त° Ś$_3$ 6 तद्दर्शिनां] ŚJambū., तद्दर्शितां J_1^{ac}, तद्दर्शितं J_1^{pc} 6 विशेषाः] J_1Jambū., विशेषः Ś 8 सत्ता] Σ, सता Ś$_1$ 10 यतो] Σ, वतो Ś$_1$ 10 जायते] J_1Ś$_1$Ś$_3$Jambū., जातये Ś$_2^{ac}$, जायेत Ś$_2^{pc}$ 10 सत्सदिति] J_1Jambū., ययात्सदिति Ś$_1$, यत्सदिति Ś$_2$, यया तत्सदिति Ś$_3$ 11 आश्रयविनाशाद्] Σ, आश्रयविनास्याद् J_1^{ac} 11 विनाश] Σ, विनानाश Ś$_3$ 11 यतः] Σ, यत्तः J_1 13 °विनाशे] Σ, °नाशे Ś$_3$ 13 विनश्यतीति] Σ, न विनश्यति। इति Ś$_3$ 14 °व्यतिरेके] J_1Jambū., °व्यतिरेको Ś 16 द्रव्यमद्रव्यं परमाण्वाकाशादि] conj., परमाण्वाकाशादि द्रव्यं सद्द्रव्यमद्रव्यं Ś$_1$Ś$_2^{pc}$Ś$_3$, परमाण्वाकाशादि द्रव्यं यदि सद्द्रव्यमद्रव्यं Ś$_2^{ac}$, परमाण्वाकाशादिद्रव्यम् अद्रव्यं J_1Jambū. 16 वा] J_1Jambū., यदि Ś

वायिकारणद्रव्ययुक्तत्वात्। सत्ता पुनः प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्त्या वर्तमानैकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यम्।

गुणकर्मसु च भावान्न कर्म न गुणः।१।२।१०।

गुणानां गुणेष्ववृत्तेः, कर्मसु च कर्मणाम्, गुणेषु कर्मसु च सत्ताया वर्तमानत्वान्न गुणकर्मणी सत्ता।

सामान्यविशेषाभावाच्च।१।२।११।

यदि सत्ता द्रव्यादीनामन्यतमा स्यादेवं द्रव्यादिष्विव सत्तायामपि द्रव्यत्वादयः सामान्यविशेषा वर्तेरन्। न चैवम्। तस्मान्न सत्ता द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि।

एकद्रव्यवत्त्वेन द्रव्यत्वमुक्तम्।१।२।१२।

यथा प्रतिद्रव्यं साकल्येन वर्तमानत्वान्न द्रव्यं सत्ता तथैकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यं द्रव्यत्वम्।

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च।१।२।१३।

द्रव्यादिष्विव द्रव्यत्वादीनां मध्यात्कश्चित्सामान्यविशेषो द्रव्यत्वे वर्तेत यदि द्रव्यं गुणः कर्म वा स्यात्। तस्मान्न द्रव्यादीनि द्रव्यत्वम्।

गुणे भावाद्गुणत्वमुक्तम्।१।२।१४।

गुणेषु गुणानामवृत्तेर्गुणत्वं च गुणेषु वर्तते तस्मान्न गुणः।

1.2.10 गुणकर्मसु] Σ, कर्मसु J$_1^s$ 1.2.10 कर्म न] Σ, कर्मण J$_1^{sac}$ 1.2.12 द्रव्यत्वमुक्तम्] J$_1^s$J$_1$Jambū., द्रव्यवदुक्तम् Ś   1.2.14 गुणे भावाद्] ŚJambū., गुणाभावाद् J$_1^s$J$_1$

---

1 समवायिकारण°] J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., समवायकारण° Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 1 प्रत्येकं] J$_1$Jambū., प्रत्येक Ś   1 °द्रव्यवत्त्वान्न] Σ, °द्रव्यवत्त्वानु Ś$_2$ 2 द्रव्यम्] J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., द्रव्य Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 4 गुणेष्ववृत्तेः] Ś$_1$Ś$_3$Jambū., गुणेष्ववृत्ते J$_1$, गुणेष्वावृत्तेः Ś$_2$ 4 च] Σ, om. J$_1$ 4 गुणेषु कर्मसु] Σ, गुणेष्वकर्मसु Ś$_2$ 7 °न्यतमा] J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., °न्यतम Ś$_1$, °न्यतमः Ś$_3$ 7 द्रव्यादिष्विव] Σ, द्रव्यादिष्वव Ś$_2^{pc}$ 7 द्रव्यत्वादयः] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., द्रव्यादयः Ś$_3$, सत्यत्वादयम् J$_1$ 8 न चैवम्] J$_1$Jambū., om. Ś   10 द्रव्यं] J$_1$Jambū., द्रव्य Ś   10 सत्ता तथैक°] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., सत्तात्तथैक° Ś$_3$, सत्वात्तथैक° J$_1$ 13 द्रव्यादिष्विव] Σ, द्रव्यादि द्रव्यादिष्विव J$_1$ 13 वर्तेत] J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., वर्तते Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 13 यदि] Σ, यदि [द्रव्यत्वं] Jambū. (conj.)   14 वा स्यात् । तस्मान्न] Σ, स्यान्न Ś$_2$ 16 गुणानामवृत्तेर्] J$_1$Jambū., गुणानामावृत्तेर् Ś

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च।१।२।१५।

यदि गुणत्वं द्रव्यं कर्म वा स्यात्, तस्मिन्द्रव्यत्वं कर्मत्वं वा सामान्यविशेषौ स्याताम्। न चैवम्। तस्मान्न द्रव्यं कर्म वा गुणत्वम्।

कर्मणि भावात्कर्मत्वमुक्तम्।१।२।१६।

कमणि कर्मत्वस्य वृत्तेः कर्मणः कर्मणि चावृत्तेर्न कर्म कर्मत्वम्।

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च।१।२।१७।

द्रव्यत्वं गुणत्वं वा कर्मत्वे स्यातां यदि द्रव्यं गुणो वा स्यात्। तस्मान्न द्रव्यगुणौ कर्मत्वम्।

सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भावः।१।२।१८।

एकशब्देन अभेदः कथ्यते न तु सङ्ख्या। लिङ्ग्यते ऽनेनेति लिङ्गं प्रत्ययः। येन लिङ्गेन सत्सदिति प्रत्ययेन प्रतीयते सत्ता तस्य सर्वत्राविशिष्टत्वाद्विशिष्टस्य च प्रत्ययस्याभावादभिन्ना सत्ता।

॥ प्रथमो ऽध्यायः॥

1.2.15 सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च] Σ, om. J_1^S 1.2.18 सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको] J_1^{Spc}Jambū., सल्लिंहाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको J_1^{Sac}, सल्लिंगविशेषाद्विशेषलिंगाभावांच्चैको J_1, सल्लिङ्गा{सलिङ्गा° $Ś_1$}विशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैके Ś 1.2.18 भावः] J_1^S, भाव इति J_1ŚJambū.

---

5 चावृत्तेर्न] em. Jambū., चावृत्तेः J_1, चावृत्तेन $Ś_1Ś_3$, चावृत्तेनु $Ś_2$ 5 कर्म कर्मत्वम्] $J_1Ś_2$Jambū., कर्मकत्वम् $Ś_1$, कर्मत्वं $Ś_3$ 10 अभेदः] J_1Jambū., भावः Ś 10 लिङ्ग्यते] Σ, लिङ्गते $Ś_2$ 11 प्रत्ययेन] Σ, प्रत्ययेर $Ś_2$ 12 प्रत्ययस्याभावाद्] J_1Jambū., प्रत्ययस्य चाभावाद् Ś

द्वितीयस्याध्यायस्य प्रथममाह्निकम् ।

एवं द्रव्यादीनां नानात्वे सिद्धे पृथिव्यादीनां द्रव्यलक्षणाविशेषादेकत्वे प्राप्ते लक्षणभेदेन वैधर्म्यमाह—

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शवती पृथिवी । २ । १ । १ ।

एते ऽस्या रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा विशेषगुणाः । अन्ये तु सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वनैमित्तिकद्रवत्वसंस्काराः । रूपं शुक्लादि । रसो मधुरादिः । गन्धः सुरभिरसुरभिश्च । स्पर्शो ऽस्या अनुष्णाशीतत्वे सति पाकजः । कार्यं वाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं च ।

रूपरसस्पर्शवत्य आपो द्रवाः स्निग्धाश्च । २ । १ । २ ।

शुक्लमधुरशीता एव रूपरसस्पर्शाः । द्रवा इति सांसिद्धिकं द्रवत्वम् । स्निग्धा इत्यासामेव स्नेहः । सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वसंस्काराश्च । कार्यं पूर्ववत् ।

तेजो रूपस्पर्शवत् । २ । १ । ३ ।

रूपं भास्वरं शुक्लं च । स्पर्श उष्ण एव । सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वनैमित्तिकद्रवत्वसंस्काराश्च । कार्यं पूर्ववत् ।

वायुः स्पर्शवान् । २ । १ । ४ ।

2.1.2 °स्पर्शवत्य आपो] J_1^{Spc} J_1Jambū., °स्पर्शवत्यापो J_1^{Sac}, °स्पर्शवत्या आपो Ś 2.1.2 द्रवाः] Σ, द्रवा J_1^S 2.1.3 तेजो रूपस्पर्शवत्] J_1^S J_1Jambū., om. Ś

---

1 नानात्वे] Σ, नानत्वे Ś$_1$ 1 द्रव्यलक्षणाविशेषाद्] Σ, द्रव्यलक्षणा(भा)विशेषाद् Ś$_1$ 1-2 प्राप्ते लक्षणभेदेन] J_1Ś$_3$Jambū., प्राप्तलक्षणभेदेन Ś$_1$, प्राप्तलक्षणभेदेर Ś$_2$ 5 °द्रवत्व°] J_1Jambū., °द्रव्यत्व° Ś 5 मधुरादिः] Σ, मधुरादि Ś$_2$ 6 गन्धः] Σ, गन्ध J_1^{ac} 6 स्पर्शो ऽस्या] Σ, स्पर्शस्या J_1 6 सति] J_1Jambū., om. Ś 7 वाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं] Σ, वाह्यमाध्यात्मिका Ś$_1$ 9 शुक्लमधुरशीता] Σ, शुक्लमधुरसीता J_1 9 सांसिद्धिकं द्रवत्वम्] J_1Jambū., सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वम् Ś 9 स्निग्धा] J_1Ś$_2$Jambū., स्निग्ध Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 10 इत्यासामेव] Σ, इत्यसामेव Ś$_1$ 10 स्नेहः] J_1Ś$_2$Jambū., स्नेहाः Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 10 सङ्ख्या°] Σ, सांख्या° Ś$_3$ 10 °परिमाण°] Σ, °परिमाणा° Ś$_2$ 13-14 रूपं ... पूर्ववत्] J_1Jambū., om. Ś

अनुष्णाशीतो ऽपाकजः स्पर्शः। सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्व-गुरुत्वसंस्काराश्च। कार्यं पूर्ववत्। भौमादिदेहा भूम्यादिलोकेषु।

त आकाशे न विद्यन्ते।२।१।५।

ते रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा न सन्त्याकाशे। तस्य गुणाः शब्दसङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागाः।

सर्पिर्जतुमधूच्छिष्टानां पार्थिवानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवताद्भिः सामान्यम्।२।१।६।

मधूच्छिष्टं सिक्थकम्। सर्पिषो जतुनो मधूच्छिष्टस्य चाग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवता या संजायते तदद्भिः समानत्वं पृथिव्याः।

त्रपुसीसलोहरजतसुवर्णानां तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवताद्भिः सामान्यम्।२।१।७।

एषां च तैजसानां यदग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवत्वमुपजायते तदद्भिः सामान्यं तेजसः।

विषाणी ककुद्मान्प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्नावानिति गोत्वे दृष्टं लिङ्गम्।२।१।८।

2.1.5 त आकाशे] $J_1^{S pc}J_1^{pc}$ŚJambū., तत्प्रकाशे J_1^{ac}, तात्प्राकाशे $J_1^{S ac}$, ता आकाशे $J_1^{S pc}$ 2.1.6 °संयोगाद्द्रवता°] $J_1$$Ś_2$$Ś_3$Jambū., °संयोगाद्रवता J_1^{S}, °सयोगाद्द्रवता° $Ś_1$ 2.1.6 सामान्यम्] $J_1^{S}J_1$Jambū., सामान्य Ś 2.1.7 त्रपुसीस°] Σ, त्रपुसीसा° $Ś_2$ 2.1.7 °रजतसुवर्णानां] J_1Jambū., °रजतसुवर्णानां च add. J_1^{S}, °रजतताम्रसुवर्णानां Ś 2.1.7 °संयोगाद्द्रवताद्भिः] Ś, °संयोगाद्रवताद्भिः $J_1J_1^{S}$ 2.1.8 विषाणी] $J_1^{S}J_1$$Ś_2$Jambū., विषाणीति $Ś_1$$Ś_3$ 2.1.8 प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्नावानिति गोत्वे] J_1Jambū., वृषभः प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्नावान्गलचर्मणा लक्ष्यत{°ते $Ś_1^{ac}$$Ś_3$} इति गोत्वं Ś 2.1.8 °वालधिः] Σ, °वालधेः J_1

---

1 ऽपाकजः] J_1Jambū., स्य पाकजः Ś 1–2 सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वसंस्काराश्च] $Ś_1$$Ś_2$Jambū., संख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वसंस्काराश्च J_1, ⟨संख्यापरि⟩ $Ś_3$ 4 ते रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा] ŚJambū., तेजपरगंधस्पर्शाः J_1 4 तस्य] J_1Jambū., ते स्य Ś 8 मधूच्छिष्टं] Σ, om. J_1 8 सिक्थकम्] em. Jambū., सक्थि+कं+⟨≚⟩ J_1, सित्थकम् Ś 8 °संयोगाद्द्रवता] Σ, °संयोगाद्रवता J_1 12 तैजसानां यदग्नि°] $J_1$$Ś_2$Jambū., तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवताद्भिः सामान्यं। एषां च तैजसानां यदग्नि° $Ś_1$ (eyeskip), तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवताद्भिः सामान्यं॥ एषां च तैजसाना{नां $Ś_3^{ac}$}मग्नि° $Ś_3$ eyeskip 12 तेजसः] J_1Jambū., तैजसः Ś

दृष्टान्तार्थं सूत्रम्। गोत्वमिति गोत्वावच्छिन्ना व्यक्तिः। विषाणं ककुदं सास्ना चास्यास्तीति विषाणी ककुद्मान्सास्नावान्। प्रान्तशब्देन कटिभागः। वाला अस्मिन्धीयन्त इति वालधिशब्देन पुच्छम्। प्रान्ते वालधिरस्येति प्रान्तेवालधिः। विषाण्यादिभिः शब्दैस्तद्वत्प्रतिपादकैरप्यर्थव्यापाराद्धर्मा एव व्यपदिश्यन्ते।

यथाप्रत्यक्षायां गोव्यक्तौ कथंचिद्गृह्यमाणा विषाणादयो लिङ्गं दृष्टमनुमापकास्तथा—

स्पर्शश्च।२।१।९।

स्पर्श उपलभ्यमानो निराश्रयस्यानुपपत्तेर्वायुमनुमापयति।

न च दृष्टानां स्पर्श इत्यदृष्टलिङ्गो वायुः।२।१।१०।

यदि खल्वयं क्षित्यादिस्पर्शो ऽभविष्यद्गन्धरसरूपैः सहोपलभेमहि। न चैवम्। तस्मात्पृथिव्यादिव्यतिरिक्तस्य वायोर्लिङ्गम्।

अद्रव्यवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यम्।२।१।११।

यः परमाणुस्वभावो वायुः स स्खल्वद्रव्यवत्त्वात्समवायिकारणरहितत्वाद्द्रव्यम्। द्रव्यं ह्यद्रव्यमनेकद्रव्यं च।

क्रियावत्त्वाद्गुणवत्त्वाच्च।२।१।१२।

2.1.9 स्पर्शश्च] Σ. स्पर्श(सु) J$_1$ 2.1.11 अद्रव्यवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यम्] J$_1^{s}$ Jambū.. अद्रव्यवत्वाद्द्रव्यं J$_1$.. अद्रव्यत्वाद्द्रव्यम् Ś$_1$Ś$_3$. अत्र द्रव्यत्वाद्द्रव्यम् Ś$_2$

---

1 दृष्टान्तार्थं] Σ. दृष्टार्थं Ś$_2$ 1 सूत्रम्] Σ. सूत्र Ś$_1$ 1 गोत्वमिति] conj.. गोत्वं इति J$_1$Ś. गोत्वं इति J$_1^{pc}$?. 'गोत्वे' इति Jambū. 1 गोत्वावच्छिन्ना] Σ. गोत्वाविच्छिन्ना J$_1$ 1 व्यक्तिः] J$_1$Jambū.. जातिः Ś 3 धीयन्त] J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū.. धीयते Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 3 पुच्छम्] Σ. पुच्छः J$_1$ 3 प्रान्ते वालधिरस्येति प्रान्तेवालधिः] Σ. प्रान्ते वालधेरस्येति प्रान्ता{प्रान्ते° J$_1^{pc}$}वालधेर् J$_1$ 4 विषाण्यादिभिः] J$_1$Ś$_1$Jambū.. विषाणादिभिः Ś$_2$Ś$_3$ 4 °र्थव्यापाराद्धर्मा] J$_1$Jambū.. °र्थ⟨स्य⟩व्यापारधर्मा Ś$_1$. °र्थव्यापाराधर्मा Ś$_2$. °र्थव्यापार{or possibly °रा}धर्मा Ś$_3$ 6 °नुमापकास्तथा] J$_1$Ś$_2$Ś$_3$Jambū.. °नुमापकः तथा Ś$_1^{pc}$. °नुमापकाः तथा Ś$_1^{?}$ 8 °नुपपत्तेर्] Σ. °नुपपत्ते Ś$_1$ 8 वायुम्] Σ. वायम् Ś$_2$ 13 °स्वभावो] Σ. °स्वाभावे J$_1$ 13 स्खल्वद्रव्य°] J$_1$Jambū.. स्खलु द्रव्य° Ś 13 समवायिकारण°] J$_1$Ś$_1$Jambū.. समवायिकारण°{°णा° Ś$_2^{pc}$} Ś$_2$. समवायकारण° Ś$_3$ 13 °रहितत्वाद्द्रव्यम्] Σ. °रहितत्वाद्द्रव्य J$_1$

क्रियावद्गुणवदिति द्रव्यलक्षणाद्यत्र क्रिया गुणाश्च समवेताः सो ऽपि महान्वायुर्द्रव्यम्।

अद्रव्यवत्त्वेन नित्यत्वमुक्तम्।२।१।१३।

परमाणुलक्षणस्य वायोरद्रव्यवत्त्वेन समवायिकारणरहितत्वेन नित्यत्वमुक्तम्।

वायोर्वायुसंमूर्च्छनं नानात्वे लिङ्गम्।२।१।१४।

तिर्यग्गामिनो वायोर्वायुसंमूर्च्छनेन वाय्वन्तरसंश्लेषेणोर्ध्वगमनं प्रवर्तते तत ऊर्ध्वगमनात्संश्लेषः संश्लेषाद्वायोरनेकत्वमनुमीयते।

ननु च—

वायुरिति सति सन्निकर्षे प्रत्यक्षाभावादृष्टं लिङ्गं न विद्यते।२।१।१५।

यथायं गौरिति गोश्चक्षुषा सन्निकर्षे सति प्रत्यक्षेण विषाणादीनि तद्योगितया दृष्टानि कदाचिल्लिङ्गं नैवं त्वचा वायोः सन्निकर्षे सत्ययं वायुरिति प्रत्यक्षेण तद्गुणतया स्पर्श उपलब्धो येनानुपलभ्यमानं कदाचिद्वायुमनुमापयेत्।

क्षित्यादिस्पर्शविलक्षणधर्मत्वादस्य स्पर्शस्य निराश्रयस्य चाभावाद्वायुराश्रय इति चेत्—

2.1.14 ॰संमूर्च्छनं] Σ, ॰सन्मूर्छनं J$_1^s$ 2.1.15 सति … विद्यते] om. J$_1$ 2.1.15 सति] ŚJambū., om. J$_1^s$ 2.1.15 ॰भावादृष्टं] Σ, ॰भावादृष्टं J$_1^s$ 2.1.15 दृष्टं लिङ्गं] Σ, द्रष्टं लिङ्गं Ś$_2$ 2.1.15 न विद्यते] Σ, र विद्यते Ś$_1$

---

1 क्रियावद्गुणवत् cf. VS 1.1.14

---

1 द्रव्यलक्षणाद्यत्र] Σ, द्रव्यलक्षणोद्यत्र J$_1$ 2 समवेताः सो ऽपि महान्वायुर्द्रव्यम्] J$_1$Ja-
mbū., समवेताश्चापि महान्वायद्व्यम् Ś 4 परमाणु॰… नित्यत्वमुक्तम्] Σ, om. Ś$_2$ (eyeskip)
4 वायोर्] J$_1$Jambū., वयोर् Ś$_1$Ś$_3$ 4 समवायिकारण॰] Ś$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., समवायकारण॰ J$_1$Ś$_3$
4 ॰रहितत्वेन] Σ, ॰रहित्वेन Ś$_1$ 6 प्रवर्तते] J$_1$Jambū., प्रवर्तेत Ś 7 संश्लेषाद्वायो॰] J$_1^{pc}$Ja-
mbū., संश्लेषाद्वयो॰ J$_1^{ac}$Ś 7 ॰रनेकत्वमनुमीयते] Σ, ॰रेकत्वमनुमीयते Ś$_3$ 11 यथायं…
गोचक्षुषा] Σ, om. J$_1$ 11 विषाणादीनि] Σ, विशेष{॰षा॰ J$_1^{ac}$}णादीनि J$_1$ 11 तद्योगितया]
J$_1$Ś$_2$Jambū., तद्योग्यतया Ś$_1$Ś$_3^{pc}$ (या corrected but reading *ac* illegible. 12 कदाचिल्लिङ्गं]
Σ, कदाचि⟨दृष्टानि⟩ल्लिङ्गं Ś$_2$ 12 नैवं] Σ, नैव Ś$_3$ 12 त्वचा] Σ, त्वरा J$_1$ 12 वायोः] Σ,
वयोः Ś$_2$ 13 कदाचिद्वायुम्] Σ, कदाचिद्वयुम् Ś$_1$ 14 ॰विलक्षणधर्मत्वाद्] conj., ॰विधर्म-
त्वाद् J$_1$Jambū., ॰वि· · · · · धर्मत्वाद् Ś (five dots in Ś$_3$) 14 निराश्रयस्य] J$_1$Ś$_2$Ś$_3$Jambū.,
निरत्रयस्या Ś$_1^{ac}$, निराश्रयस्या Ś$_1^{pc}$ 14 चाभावाद्वायुर्] Σ, चाभावद्वायुर् Ś$_1$ 15 चेत्] Σ,
च J$_1$

सामान्यतोदृष्टाच्चाविशेषः । २ । १ । १६ ।

आकाशादीनामपि परोक्षत्वात्तत्प्रतिषेधेन वायोरेवायं स्पर्श इत्ययं विशेष एतस्मात्सामान्यतोदृष्टान्नावगम्यते। विभूनां स्पर्शवत्त्वे भावानां प्रतिघात इति चेत्—एवं तर्हि वायोरेवायं भवत्प्रसिद्धस्य स्पर्शो न दशमस्य द्रव्यस्येति कथं ज्ञायते।

तस्मादागमिकम् । २ । १ । १७ ।

तस्माद्वायुरस्तीति वाक्यमागमिकं प्रवादमात्रमित्यर्थः।

नैतत्।

संज्ञाकर्म त्वस्मद्विशिष्टानां लिङ्गम् । २ । १ । १८ ।

अस्मदादीनां सकाशाद्यो भगवान्विज्ञानादिभिर्विशिष्टो महेश्वरस्तदीयं संज्ञाप्रणयनं नवानामेव द्रव्याणां भावे लिङ्गं दशमस्य संज्ञानभिधानात्। तस्मान्नवैव द्रव्याणि। अतो वायोरेव स्पर्शः। अस्मद्विशिष्टानामिति पूजायां बहुवचनम्।

स कथं ज्ञायत इत्युच्यते।

प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकत्वात्संज्ञाकर्मणः । २ । १ । १९ ।

प्रत्यक्षेण हि पदार्थमालोचयन्तः संज्ञाः प्रणयन्ति दृष्टं च दारकस्य नामकरणे प्रणीतास्चेमाः खलु संज्ञास्तस्मान्मन्यामहे—अस्ति भगवानस्मद्विशिष्टो योऽस्मदादिपरोक्षाणामपि भावानां प्रत्यक्षदर्शी येनेदं संज्ञादि प्रणीतमिति।

2.1.16 °दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः] J$_1^S$Jambū.. °दृष्टच्चाविशेषः J$_1$.. °दृष्टच्चाविशेषः Ś$_1$Ś$_3$.. °दृष्टच्चावि-शेषः Ś$_2$ 2.1.17 तस्मादागमिकम्] J$_1^S$J$_1$Jambū.. तस्मादागामिकम् Ś   2.1.18 संज्ञाकर्म त्वस्मद्विशिष्टानां] J$_1^S$J$_1$Jambū.. संज्ञाकर्मत्वमस्माद्विशिष्टानां Ś

---

2 परोक्षत्वात्तत्प्रतिषेधेन] Σ. परोक्षत्वात्प्रतिषेधेन J$_1$ 2 वायोरेवायं] Σ. वायोरेवायं (अन्य Ś$_1^{ac}$) Ś$_1$ 3 एतस्मात्] Σ. एएतस्मात् Ś$_3$ 3 °दृष्टान्नावगम्यते] J$_1$Jambū.. °दृष्टान्नावगम्यते Ś   3 भावानां प्रतिघात] ŚJambū.. भावप्रतिघात J$_1$ 4 वायोरेवायं] J$_1$Ś$_1$.. वयोरेवायं Ś$_3$.. वायोरेवेयं Ś$_2$ 4 द्रव्यस्येति] Σ. द्रवस्येति J$_1$ 7 वाक्यमागमिकं] J$_1$Jambū.. वाक्यमागामिक Ś   11 भावे लिङ्गं] Σ. भावलिङ्गं Ś$_3$ 11 तस्मान्नवैव] Σ. तस्मान्नवेव Ś$_2$ 12 अस्मद्विशिष्टानाम्] Σ. अस्माद्विशिष्टानाम् J$_1$ 15 प्रणयन्ति] Σ. प्रणमंति J$_1$ 15 दारकस्य] Σ. om. Ś$_3$ 17 यो ऽस्मदादि°] J$_1$Jambū.. यस्मादादि° Ś   17 °दर्शी येनेदं] Ś$_1$Jambū.. om. [illegible] °दर्शि योनदं J$_1^{ac}$.. °दर्शी योनेदं J$_1^{pc}$.. °दर्शीन्नियेदं Ś$_1$.. °दर्शीनेदं Ś$_2$ [illegible]

निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनमित्याकाशस्य लिङ्गम् ।२।१।२०।

यदेतन्निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनं च पुरुषस्य द्वारादिना भवति न भित्त्यादौ तदाकाशकृतमतो निष्क्रमणप्रवेशने आकाशस्य लिङ्गमिति। मूर्ताभावो ह्याकाशम्।

तन्न।

तदलिङ्गमेकद्रव्यवत्त्वात्कर्मणः ।२।१।२१।

निष्क्रमणादि कर्म पुरुषे वर्तमानमेकद्रव्यं कर्मेत्युक्तत्वान्निष्क्रियत्वाच्चाकाशस्याकाशावृत्ति कथं तद्गमयेदसम्बन्धात्।

यथा लोष्टवृत्ति पतनं गुरुत्वस्य लिङ्गमेवं पुरुषवृत्ति निष्क्रमणमाकाशस्य लिङ्गमिति चेत्—न—

कारणान्तरानुक्लृप्तिवैधर्म्याच्च ।२।१।२२।

गुरुत्वं कर्मणो ऽसमवायिकारणमुक्तं तदनुमीयतां न त्वाकाशस्यासमवायिकारणत्वं युज्यते नित्यत्वद्रव्यत्वानाश्रितत्वैराकाशस्य गुरुत्वादिनासमवायिकारणेन वैधर्म्यात्।

यदुक्तं निष्क्रमणं चाकाशकृतत्वाद्द्वारादिनेत्येतन्न।

संयोगादभावः कर्मणः ।२।१।२३।

भित्त्यादिना स्पर्शवद्द्रव्येण शरीरादेः कर्माधारस्य संयोगान्निष्क्रमणं निवर्तते न त्वाकाशाभावात्। तस्य सर्वगतत्वात्तत्रापि भावः। तस्माच्छब्दलिङ्गमेवाकाशम्।

2.1.21 तदलिङ्गम्] Σ. तदालिङ्गम् J_1 2.1.21 °कद्रव्यवत्त्वात्] J_1Jambū., °कद्रव्यवत्वा J_1^S. °कद्रव्यत्वात् Ś 2.1.22 °नुक्लृप्तिवैधर्म्याच्च] $J_1^S J_1$Jambū., °नुततस्यवैधर्म्या च $Ś_1^{ac}$, °नु(तत्व्य)तिवैधर्म्या च $Ś_1^{pc}$, °नु(त्क्लृप्ति)वैधर्म्याच्च $Ś_2$, °नुततिवैधर्म्याच्च $Ś_3$

---

1 प्रवेशनम्] $J_1^S J_1$Jambū., प्रवेशम् Ś 2 च] J_1Jambū., om. Ś 2 तदाकाश°] J_1Jambū., तदाकाशे Ś 2 °कृतमतो] $Ś_1 Ś_2$Jambū., °कृतनतो J_1, °कृतसोर (or °सरो) $Ś_3$ 3 °प्रवेशने आकाशस्य] J_1Jambū., °प्रवेशेनाकाशस्य Ś 3 मूर्ताभावो] Σ, पूर्वाभावो J_1 6 कर्म] Σ, किर्म $Ś_?^{ac}$ 6 वर्तमानमेकद्रव्यं] Σ, वर्तमानेमकद्रव्यं $Ś_2^{ac}$ 7 निष्क्रियत्वाच्चाकाशस्याकाशावृत्ति] Σ, निःक्रियत्वाच्चकशस्य आकाशवृत्ति J_1 7 °सम्बन्धात्] $J_1 Ś_2$Jambū., °सम्बन्धनात् $Ś_1 Ś_3$ 8 गुरुत्वस्य लिङ्गमेवं] J_1Jambū., गुरुत्वलिङ्गमेव Ś 11 त्वाकाशस्यासमवायि°] Σ, त्वाकाशस्य। समवायि° J_1 12 °श्रितत्वैराकाशस्य] J_1Jambū., श्रितत्वेना{°न $Ś_1$}काशस्य Ś 13 वैधर्म्यात्] J_1Jambū., वैधर्म्यम् Ś 14 निष्क्रमणं चाकाश°] J_1Jambū., निष्क्रमणमाकाश° Ś 14 °कृतत्वाद्द्वारा°] Σ, °कृतत्वाद्वारा° J_1 16 स्पर्शवद्द्रव्येण] Σ, स्पर्शवद्रव्येण J_1

भेर्यादीनामेव निमित्तानां शब्दो गुण इति चेत्—न।

कारणगुणपूर्वः कार्ये गुणो दृष्टः कार्यान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च शब्दः स्पर्शवतामगुणः।२।१।२४।

इह ये स्पर्शवतां विशेषगुणा एकैकेन्द्रियग्राह्यास्ते कारणगुणैः कार्ये निष्पाद्यन्ते। न च भेर्यवयवेषु रूपादय इव कश्चिच्छब्दभागः समवेत उपलभ्यते। तस्मादकारणगुणपूर्वत्वान्न भेर्यादेः स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुणः शब्दः। यश्च स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुणः स कार्ये यावत्कार्यमुपलभ्यमानो दृष्टः। न चैवं शब्दस्ततो न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः। किञ्च स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुण आरब्धे कार्ये कारणगुणैरारभ्यते न च यदा शब्देन शब्द आरभ्यते तदा किञ्चित्कार्यमुत्पन्नं पश्यामः। तस्मात्कार्यान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च न शब्दः स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुण इति।

परत्र समवायात्प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च नात्मगुणो न मनोगुणः।२।१।२५।

परत्र बहिरित्यर्थः। ये खल्वात्मगुणास्ते सुखादय इवान्तःशरीरमुपलभ्यन्ते। न चैवं शब्दो बहिर्बहुभिरुपलभ्यमानत्वात्। न चात्मगुणो बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्यः, अयं तु श्रोत्रप्रत्यक्षः, तस्मान्नात्मगुणः। अत एव बहिरुपलभ्यमानत्वाद्बाह्येन्द्रियप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न मनोगुणः। श्रोत्रप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न दिक्कालयोः।

तस्माद्गुणः सन्—

2.1.24 कार्ये गुणो] J₁Ś₂Ś₃Jambū., कार्यगुणो J₁^s, कार्यो गुणो Ś₁   2.1.24 दृष्टः] Σ, दृष्टिः Ś₂   2.1.25 परत्र समवायात्प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च] J₁^s Jambū., परत्र प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च J₁, परत्रात्प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च Ś   2.1.25 नात्मगुणो] Σ, नात्मनो Ś₃   2.1.25 मनोगुणः] J₁Ś₂Ś₃Jambū., मनोगुणः J₁^s, मुनोगुणः Ś₁

---

1 भेर्यादीनामेव] Ś₁^pc Ś₂Ś₃Jambū., भेदादीनामेव J₁, भेर्यादीनामिव Ś₁^ac   1 गुण इति] Ś₂Ś₃Jambū. (em.), गुणा इति J₁, गुणदिति Ś₁   4 एकैकेन्द्रियग्राह्यास्] J₁Ś₂Jambū., एकैकेन्द्रियाग्राह्यास् Ś₁Ś₂   4 ते कारणगुणैः] Σ, तेः कारकगुणैः J₁   5 रूपादय] Σ, रूपायद Ś₃   6 °कारणगुणपूर्वत्वान्] Σ, °कारणपूर्वत्वान् J₁   7 दृष्टः] J₁Jambū., दृष्टिः Ś   7 शब्दस्ततो] Σ, शब्दस्ततो⟨स्ततो⟩ J₁   7 न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः] J₁Ś₁^pc Ś₂^pc Ś₃Jambū., न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः Ś₁^ac, न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणाः Ś₂^ac   8 °गुणैरारभ्यते] Σ, °गुणैरारभ्यते Ś₂   9 उत्पन्नं] Σ, उत्पन्ल(भ्यते) Ś₃^ac   13 खल्वात्मगुणास्ते] Σ, खल्वादत्मगुणास्ते J₁   13 सुखादय] Σ, सुखदय Ś   14 चैवं] J₁Jambū., चैव Ś   14 °लभ्यमानत्वात्] Σ, °लभ्युमानत्वात् J₁   14 चात्मगुणो] J₁Jambū., चात्मगुण Ś   14–15 बाह्येन्द्रिय°… तस्मान्] em. Jambū., बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्यः अयं तु श्रोत्रप्रत्यक्षः+⟨प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न मनोगुणः श्रोत्रप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न दिक्कालयोः⟩तस्मान् J₁, बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्याः अयं तु श्रोत्रप्रत्यक्षस्तस्मान् Ś

लिङ्गमाकाशस्य।२।१।२६।

तस्मादुपलभ्यमानः शब्द आकाशं गमयति।

द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते।२।१।२७।

यथाद्रव्यवत्त्वात्परमाणुभूतो वायुर्द्रव्यं नित्यश्च एवमाकाशं कारणद्रव्याभावाद्द्रव्यं नित्यं च।

तत्त्वं भावेन।२।१।२८।

यथा सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भाव एवं शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैकमाकाशम्।

॥ इति द्वितीयस्याद्यमाह्निकम्॥

2.1.27 द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे] J_1^S J_1 Jambū., द्रव्यनित्यत्वे Ś 2.1.27 व्याख्याते] Σ, व्याख्या(य)ते J_1^S

---

7 सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भावः cf. VS 1.2.18

---

4 वायुर्द्रव्यं] J_1 $Ś_3$ Jambū., वायुद्रव्यं $Ś_1 Ś_2$ 4 कारण°] Σ, करण° $Ś_3$ 7 °भावाच्चैको] J_1 Jambū., °भावादेको Ś 7 शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद्] J_1 Jambū., शब्दलिङ्गविशेषाद् Ś 8 °कमाकाशम्] em. Jambū., °कमाकाशमिति Σ Col. इति द्वितीयस्याद्यम्] em. Jambū., ॥ द्वितीयस्याद्यम् Σ

COMMENTARY

1.1.1 **158.2**. *kasyacid brāhmaṇasya vedābhyāsavaśena vyapagatakalmaṣasyedaṃ pratibabhau.* I follow the Śāradā manuscripts; Jambūvijaya reads with J$_1$ *vyapagatakalmaṣasyedaṃ **vedavākyaṃ** pratibabhau*. The question is to decide whether *vedavākyam* has been omitted scribally in one tradition or has been inserted scribally in the other. There can be no clear-cut decision, but I find the word suspiciously over-explicit, especially in view of the preceding *vedābhyāsavaśena* and the *idaṃ vākyam* that follows almost immediately.

158.2–3. *aśarīraṃ vāva santaṃ priyāpriye na spṛśata iti.* This famous *Chāndogyopaniṣad* line is probably the *śruti* passage most frequently quoted in Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya texts. Nozawa (111a, n.1)[1] notes its occurrence in the three oldest commentaries on the PDhS; it can also be found in other texts, even being quoted twice in Vādivāgīśvara's *Mānamanohara* (39.3 and 143.2–3).

158.3. *tata idaṃ vākyam ālocya kaṇabhakṣam ājagāma.* Thus with J$_1$ and Jambūvijaya. The form *kaṇabhakṣaṇam* found in the Śāradā manuscripts seems to be unattested elsewhere. Perhaps it cannot be ruled out as a possibility though.

158.4. *bhagavann anena vākyenāpahataśarīratvasya kṣemasādhanatā kathyate.* For *vākyenāpahata*° as in J$_1$, followed by Jambūvijaya, Ś$_1$ and Ś$_2$ have *vākyena vyapahata*°. It is on the whole probable that this is secondary, influenced by the earlier *vyapagatakalmaṣasya*; note that Ś$_3$ actually has *vākyena vyapagata*°, assimilating still further—it is of course unlikely that the latter reading was in σ.

The conjecture °*śarīratvasya* for the transmitted °*śarīrasya* has been dictated by considerations of sense and syntax. Without altering Jambūvijaya's text, i.e. reading *vākyenāpahataśarīrasya*, Nozawa translates the sentence as follows: 'Adorable one! It is set forth in this passage that the removal of the body is the means to the final beatitude' (98a). Aside from the question whether 'final beatitude' is an appropriate rendering of *kṣema*, it is hardly possible that *apahataśarīra* can mean 'the removal of the body,' not does even an interpretation as a karmadhāraya seem at all plausible to me. But it is difficult to construe the transmitted text in such a way as to yield completely satisfactory sense: one would wish to take it to mean roughly 'this Vedic statement teaches that one who has freed himself from his body attains peace,' with *sādhana* in the sense of 'attaining,' but for this one would really require °*sādhanam* in place of °*sādhanatā*. This may not be an insuperable objection, but it seems on the whole a better solution to conjecture loss of a *tva* in the archetype;

1 When no year is specified, all references to 'Nozawa' in this commentary are to Nozawa 1993a, and give the pagenumber, column (a or b) and, where applicable, footnote number.

reading *anena vākyenāpahataśarīratvasya kṣemasādhanatā kathyate* the syntax is regular and, a subsidiary advantage perhaps, *sādhana* may then be taken as 'means, instrument,' the only sense in which Candrānanda uses the word elsewhere.[2]

158.7–8. *ataḥśabdo 'pi vairāgyaprajñākaṣāyaparipākādikāṃ śiṣyaguṇasampadaṃ hetutvenāpadiśati.*[3] For °*kaṣāyaparipākādīnāṃ* Jambūvijaya prints °*kathāparipākādīnāṃ*, with no variants reported in his apparatus. This reading is however only that of J_1 *post correctionem* and, consequently, of J_2. J_1's reading *ante correctionem*, °*kathāyaparipākādīnāṃ*, is almost certainly a result of misreading of Śāradā *ṣā* as the very similar *thā*.[4] The senseless °*kathāya*° was subsequently corrected, probably by a later hand, to °*kathā*°, by the cancellation of the *ya*. Considerations of sense confirm that this correction is a wrong one. I can adduce no parallel to *kathāparipāka* as a virtue of a student, and even find it rather difficult to say what precisely might be meant,[5] whereas *kaṣāyaparipāka* gives good sense, fitting well with the preceding items in the list (which is possibly a hierarchically ordered one), and though admittedly not a term which one immediately associates with Vaiśeṣika, it has close parallels in the Hindu tradition. I may in the first place point to a verse quoted from *smṛti*[6] in Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad *Brahmasūtra* 3.4.26: *kaṣāyapaktiḥ karmāṇi jñānaṃ tu paramā gatiḥ | kaṣāye karmabhiḥ pakve tato jñānaṃ pravartate* || (ed. J.L. Shastri, Delhi 1980, p. 802–803).[7] It should also be noted that the term is semantically very close to *malaparipāka*, an important concept in (especially dualist) Śaiva metaphysics and soteriology, and one which it is very likely that Candrānanda was familiar with.[8]

2 The other occurrences of *sādhana* in Candrānanda's commentary are the *kāny asya sādhanāni* that follows almost immediately after our sentence here, *sādhanāny asyedānīṃ dravyaguṇakarmāṇi vakṣyāmaḥ* in the *avataraṇa* to 1.1.4 and *tasya* (scil. *dharmasya*) *vaidiko vidhiḥ sādhanam* in the *avataraṇa* to 6.1.1 (45.3).

3 I have discussed this passage briefly in Isaacson 1995, 761–763. Hara (1995, 210 and 221 n. 10) has pointed out a resemblance between this part of Candrānanda's commentary and a passage in Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on the *Pāśupatasūtra*.

4 For other indications that J_1 has been copied from an original in Śāradā script see p. 150 above.

5 Nozawa translates '. . . and also the word **'henthforth'** [sic] indicates that the accomplishment of such necessary qualifications of a disciple as detachment, intelligence, ability to carry on discussion, etc., is the ground (based on which the sage imparts him the knowledge of the nature of *dharma*)' (98a): the rendering of *kathāparipāka* here may be the best that one can hit on, but still is a little uncomfortable and does not fit well in the passage in my opinion. Hara (1992, 221 n. 10) quotes the passage, giving the text as edited by Jambūvijaya, but offers no translation.

6 I am at present unaware of the source of the verse.

7 My attention was first drawn to this passage by a discussion in an unpublished dissertation by Roger Marcaurelle *Śaṅkara and Renunciation: A Reinterpretation.* PhD thesis McGill University 1993.

8 The fact that there was in many cases a close relation between Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika authors

Finally, the use of *api* here is worth noting as well. Nozawa's translation 'also' (98a) does not really make good sense. The function of the particle here seems weaker, marking the change of subject by its slight emphasis of *atahśabdaḥ*, and it is perhaps best left untranslated. Should one nonetheless wish to render it in some way, a phrase such as 'on the other hand' or 'for its part' might be used, or, less obstrusively, perhaps simply an initial 'And.'

1.1.2 **159.2–3**. *abhyudayo brahmādilokeṣu ceṣṭaśarīraprāptir anarthoparamaś ca.* I adopt this reading of Ś rather than J_1's °*lokeṣv iṣṭaśarīraprāptir*, for which Jambūvijaya has chosen, chiefly on the grounds that the double *ca* construction seems by a fraction the *lectio difficilior*. Nozawa: '**Prosperity** means attainment of a desired body in the world of *Brahmā* and so on' (98b), omitting to translate *anarthoparamaś ca*: 'and the cessation of [all] calamities.'

159.3–4. *niḥśreyasam apy ātmano vaiśeṣikaguṇābhāvarūpo mokṣaḥ.* This is the reading of all the Śāradā manuscripts, including $Ś_1$, although Jambūvijaya does not report this in his critical apparatus. J_1, followed by Jambūvijaya, has *adhyātmano* for *apy ātmano*, but this reading is clearly secondary. First of all, there is no reason that I can think of why Candrānanda should have used a word other than *ātman*, the only word for 'soul' which we find elsewhere in his commentary and the standard one in Vaiśeṣika works in general. Secondly, unlike *adhyātma* (neuter), the noun *adhyātman* is very poorly attested indeed, as far as I can see; the staff of the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles* has only been able to find two occurrences, both from the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (7.12.27 and 7.12.29; cf. EDSHP s.v., p. 1785). Misreading of *py* as *dhy* is easy enough in Śāradā and other Northern scripts. The *api* serves the same function as in *atahśabdo 'pi* in the commentary on 1.1.1 (see above).

1.1.3 **159.8**. *tad iti hiraṇyagarbhaparāmarśaḥ | hiraṇyaṃ reto 'syeti kṛtvā bhagavān maheśvara evocyate.* This interpretation of the *tat* in the sūtra's *tadvacanāt* raises some interesting questions, which Nozawa has not commented on.[9] That Candrānanda should take it as referring to God, and that God for him should be Maheśvara, i.e. Śiva, is not surprising, but what lies behind the introduction of Hiraṇyagarbha—why doesn't Candrānanda simply say that *tat* refers to God?[10] Perhaps the answer

and certain Śaiva groups has long been known. As an illustration of the term *malaparipāka*, I quote a single passage from a Śaiva Siddhānta work: the commentary by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (a Kashmiri) on the *Mokṣakārikā* of Sadyojyotis: *nanv īśvaro 'pi kathaṃ na sarveṣāṃ yugapan mokṣahetuḥ, apekṣyābhāvāt | na, malaparipākāpekṣyatvāt, anyathā yathādṛṣṭaniyamānupapatteḥ* (*Aṣṭaprakaraṇa* 259.14–15).

9 Nor has Chemparathy, in his article on Candrānanda's doctrines with regard to God (1970), said anything about them.

10 In the commentary on the reprise of 1.1.3 as 10.21 our commentator does do essentially

lies in some explanation of the sūtra which we no longer have access to but which was in Candrānanda's mind when he wrote this. Alternatively, it may simply be the case that Candrānanda was aware of and indeed accepted an older tradition according to which Hiraṇyagarbha is the author of the Vedas, but regarded this as an emanation or embodiment of Śiva,[11] rather than as an independent deity (whether or not identical with Brahmā). Such a view is indeed known from Śaiva sources which can be placed in Kashmir and at a period that may be close to Candrānanda's date; thus the great dualist theologian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the *Kiraṇāgama* introduces a *pūrvapakṣa* objecting on this ground to the position that the *āgama*s are the highest form of revelation because they were revealed by Śiva: *nanu* ***vedādijñānāny** evaṃ harihara**hiraṇyagarbhādy**ātmakaprasiddha**śivakṛ**tāni parāṇi bhaviṣyanti*. Rāmakaṇṭha himself is not convinced by this view, rejecting the objection with the words *tad ayuktam, teṣām aśivarūpamuktyupadeśakatvena śivakṛtatvāsiddheḥ*,[12] but it is likely that the opponents here are not merely imaginary ones. The same author, in his commentary on Sadyojyotis' *Mokṣakārikā*, also remarks ***vedādīnām** api racanā kartāraṃ na vyabhicarati*| ***hiraṇyagarbhaprabhṛtayaḥ** kartāro 'bhiyuktaiḥ smaryante* (*Aṣṭaprakaraṇam* 276.4–5); here he adds no further comment. Presumably his objection is only to the identification of Hiraṇyagarbha and other presumed authors of the Vedas with Śiva—precisely the identification Candrānanda makes here.[13] The particular bit of exegesis by which Candrānanda wishes to make plausible that Hiraṇyagarbha may be a name of (a manifestation of) Śiva utilises, it could be said, the fact that Hiraṇyaretas and Suvarṇaretas are somewhat better known names/epithets of Śiva.

A less important point to which attention may be drawn is that the Śāradā manuscripts all read *śrībhagavān* instead of *bhagavān*. Like Jambūvijaya, I follow J_1 here, regarding it as more likely that a scribe should add the additional honorific than that one should have omitted it (cf. also the similar case mentioned on p. 149 above).

159.16. *pṛthivītvābhisambandhāt pṛthivī*| *evam abādisaṃjñāḥ*. Jambūvijaya's **1.1.4**
emendation *pṛthivītvābhisambandhāt* for the *pṛthivītvādisambandhāt* of $Ś_1$ and $Ś_2$ is obviously correct; as Nozawa points out (111b n. 6) the same words also occur in the PDhS (27.9). The other emendation, *abādisaṃjñāḥ* where the manuscripts

this, writing *tanubhuvanādikāryatayā vijñāto bhagavān īśvaraḥ, tatpraṇayanāc cāmnāyasya siddhaṃ prāmāṇyam* (76.11).

11 On the notion of God's taking on a body to teach the Vedas, particularly as discussed in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, see p. 33f. above.

12 Mr. D. Goodall kindly made these passages available to me from his edition (in progress) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇavṛtti*.

13 In the Vedic tradition itself Hiraṇyagarbha is given as the name of the author of a single hymn, *Ṛgveda* 10. 121; cf. Gonda 1975, 78.

have and Jambūvijaya prints *abādisamjñā*, is a very minimal one, as the following word is *navaiva*. This starts a new sentence, but the manuscripts are in any case all inconsistent in the application of sandhi. The plural is somewhat more natural, as of course more than one *samjñā* is intended, and one may also point to a parallel in Candrānanda's commentary on 6.1.3: *santi caitā brāhmaṇādisaṃjñāḥ, tā yena pratyakṣam artham ālocya praṇītā iti sūtrārthaṃ varṇayanti* (45.15–16).

1.1.5 **160.6**. *ete saptadaśa kaṇṭhoktā rūpādayo guṇāḥ*. Nozawa's rendering, 'These seventeen, color etc., enumerated one by one, are qualities' (98b), is incorrect; it is based on Monier-Williams' misleading lemma s.v. *kaṇṭhokta*. The word is correctly rendered by Frauwallner in his translation of the close parallel in the PDhS: 'Die ausdrücklich genannten Eigenschaften' (1992, 138).

1.1.6 **160.12–14**. *evaṃ ṣaṇṇāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmyavaidharmyaparijñānaṃ viṣa-yadoṣadarśanadvāreṇa vairāgyotpattau satyāṃ niḥśreyase sādhye dharmahetuḥ.* The question addressed here is one fundamental to the Vaiśeṣika's claims to present a doctrine that is soteriologically relevant: how can the study of the categories of the Vaiśeṣika be said to contribute to the attainment of liberation (*niḥśreyasa*), which has in 1.1.2 been said to arise from *dharma*? On this point, as Nozawa remarks (111b n.9), Candrānanda's position and wording are obviously related to those of Praśastapāda, who writes in the PDhS *dravyaguṇakarmasāmānya-viśeṣasamavāyānāṃ ṣaṇṇāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmyavaidharmyatattvajñānaṃ niḥśreyasahetuḥ* (6.14–15).[14] Of course in this sentence the intermediate role, so to speak, of *dharma* in the process is not referred to, but the difference may be chiefly due to the fact that Candrānanda felt he could not avoid referring to it (via the predicate *dharmahetuḥ*), in view of 1.1.2 which would still be fresh in any reader's mind. See also the closing sentence of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS (ad 10.21 *tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam iti*, a reprise of 1.1.3): *evaṃ dravyādīnāṃ sādharmyavaidharmyaparijñānād vairāgyadvāreṇa jñānotpatter ātmā jñātavya ityādivākyebhyaś copāsākrameṇa vijñānāvāpter niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* (76.12–13).

The explicit mention of *vairāgya* in both these places, in ways that seem to stress its importance for the process of liberation, together with its inclusion as the first of the virtues of a student mentioned in the commentary on 1.1.1, suggests a difference in emphasis from Praśastapāda. It should be remembered that according to Praśastapāda's classical presentation of the categories *vairāgya* is a positive entity, not merely the absence of *rāga*; it is classified as a sub-type of the quality desire (*icchā*), being defined with the words *doṣadarśanād viṣayatyāgecchā vairāgyam* (PDhS 261.13–14).[15] This formulation was clearly in Candrānanda's

14 Cf. also the sūtra found (only) as Śaṃkara Miśra's 1.1.4, on which see p. 234 below.

15 For this reason 'detachment,' the term used by Nozawa to translate *vairāgya* (e.g. 98a [illegible]

mind when he wrote the words we have here. If Praśastapāda refers to *vairāgya* at all in his account of liberation, it is in a very indirect way; cf. *jñānapūrvakāt tu kṛtād asaṃkalpitaphalād viśuddhe kule jātasya duḥkhavigamopāyajijñāsor ācāryam upasaṃgamyotpannaṣaṭpadārthatattvajñānasyājñānanivṛttau* ***viraktasya*** *rāgadveṣādyabhāvāt tajjayor dharmādharmayor anutpattau pūrvasaṃcitayoś copabhogān nirodhe saṃtoṣasukhaṃ śarīraparicchedaṃ cotpādya rāgādinivṛttau nivṛttilakṣaṇaḥ kevalo dharmaḥ paramārthadarśanajaṃ sukhaṃ kṛtvā nivartate | tadā nirodhān nirbījasyātmanaḥ śarīrādinivṛttiḥ | punaḥ śarīrādyanutpattau dagdhendhanānalavad upaśamo mokṣa iti* (PDhS 281.19–282.5).[16] Here it may not be utterly impossible that Praśastapāda would have explained *viraktasya* as being equivalent to *vairāgyavataḥ*, but it is more plausible that it is instead to be understood purely negatively (as is *rāgādinivṛttau*).[17] Thus Śrīdhara glosses *vicchinnarāgadveṣasaṃskārasya* (NK^2 631.17) and Vyomaśiva adds no comment. Of course the absence of *rāga* does not exclude the presence of the quality *vairāgya*, for like the latter the former too is only a sub-type of *icchā*, so there is nothing incompatible between the two accounts, but there is an appreciable difference in stress.[18]

160.14–16. *abhyudaye sādhye dharmahetutvaṃ punar amīṣāṃ same yajeteti pṛthivyāḥ | adho 'mbūni nayatītyādi yathāsvam anyeṣāṃ dravyāṇām | guṇānāṃ tu kṛṣṇam ālabhetetyādi | karmaṇāṃ tu vrīhīn avahantītyādi.* With regard to (this-wordly) exaltation too, the question of the relevance of the Vaiśeṣika's categories may be asked. Since *abhyudaya* is to be attained chiefly through the *dharma* produced by Vedic ritual, Candrānanda illustrates the importance of Vaiśeṣika categoriology by some quotations which from the context one expects to be taken from the Vedic corpus, though he does not explicitly state that their origin lies

completely satisfactory choice.

16 On this passage see Frauwallner 1956, 236–237.

17 There is thus a certain redundancy in the repetition, which can perhaps be best explained (the commentators offer no help) by saying that Praśastapāda refers to the same phenomenon twice because it plays a part in two different ways. First of all the extirpation of *rāga*, *dveṣa* and so on is important in that it entails that fresh *dharma* and *adharma* are not produced (cf. VS 6.2.17: *icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ*). But it is also important in itself, as leaving the soul devoid of specific qualities with the exception of the *nivṛttilakṣaṇa dharma* which itself passes away, after producing *paramārthadarśanaja sukha*.

18 The emphasis on *vairāgya* seems to form a genuine difference from other Vaiśeṣika authors as well. Vyomaśiva, for instance, who sketches the path to liberation in some detail, including discussions of opposing views on the topic, (Vyo^2 vol. 1 2.20–11.25), does not seem to mention it (though admittedly the text is not preserved quite complete here), only referring to the destruction of desire and so on, which as remarked above, is not the same as *vairāgya*. The mention of *upāsā* in Candrānanda's commentary on 10.21 should also be noted, as well as the distinction apparently made between *jñāna* and *vijñāna*. I reserve discussion for the commentary on that passage.

there. Rather interestingly, neither Jambūvijaya nor I have been able to trace any of them to such a source. Only one of them, *vrīhīn avahanti*, is a tag which is often quoted as if from a Vedic source, for instance in Mīmāṃsā texts.[19] It is incidentally mistranslated by Nozawa 'They thresh rice' (99a); *avahanti* is of course a singular.

In the case of *adho 'mbūni nayati* the manuscripts all are clearly corrupt. Jambūvijaya's conjecture seems a very good one; it is close to J_1's reading, correcting a single *akṣara*, *po*, to *dho*, the *akṣara* that the Śāradā manuscripts have at the corresponding place. It also yields appropriate sense—after an example referring to earth we expect one mentioning the next substance of the list.

An interesting and somewhat comparable passage may be found in Udayana's *Tātparyapariśuddhi*. There, commenting on a sentence in the *Tātparyaṭīkā* which runs *api ca dravyaguṇakarmaṇām abhimatānabhimatopāyatāprajñāpanena yathāyatham sarvā vidyāḥ prekṣāvataḥ pravartayanti nivartayanti vā* (NBh² 67.20–21), Udayana illustrates by means of quotations the relevance of the first three categories—the ones for which Candrānanda gives examples—not only in Vedic ritual but also in other areas of knowledge: *dravyasya yathā dadhnā juhotītyādi, guṇasya yathāruṇayā somaṃ krīṇātītyādi. karmaṇo yathā vrīhīn avahantītyādi| daṇḍanītyām api yathā dravyasya svāmātyetyādi. guṇasya yathā sāmabhedetyādi. karmaṇo yathā śastraśikṣā gajavājivāhanam ityādi vārtāyām api dravyasya yathā yathartu bījaṃ saṃgṛhṇīyād ityādi. guṇasya yathā bhūmiṃ plāvayec choṣayed ityādi. karmaṇo yathā sthānāntaraṃ ninīṣann anokaham abhimantrayed ityādi* (NBh² 147.22–148.14).

1.1.7 **161.11**. *paratvāparatvadvitvadvipṛthaktvapārimāṇḍalyādayo 'kāraṇam*. With a little hesitation I have accepted Jambūvijaya's emendation: the manuscripts point to °*pārimaṇḍalyādayo* as the archetypal reading. But I regard this as an error in the archetype; the form *pārimaṇḍalya* is one which I have been unable to find in other sources, and *pārimāṇḍalya* seems to be virtually unanimously transmitted in the manuscripts of the PDhS (where the word occurs at 18.12 and 130.24–25), including those which I have been able to consult which have their origin in Kashmir.[20] It also could be called the *lectio difficilior*, as the derivation of the form seems less straightforward than that of *pārimaṇḍalya* would be.

1.1.10 **162.11**. *evaṃ kānicid dravyāṇy ārambhakāni kānicin naiva*. The Śāradā manuscripts add *ca* after *evaṃ*; this reading is adopted by Jambūvijaya (who does not report that the particle is not in J_1). It is difficult to choose; the *ca* is peculiar here (Nozawa leaves it untranslated, with no comment), as the sentence starts a new paragraph, and one could therefore call it the *lectio difficilior*. Its omission in J_1 might be

19 E.g. the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*, where it is given as an example of a *niyamavidhi* (244.24, §243). It is also found in quoted in e.g. the *Nyāyamañjarī* (NM² vol. 1 670.11).

20 On the manuscript transmission of the PDhS see the preliminary remarks in appendix 3 below.

haplographical (*va* being of course similar to *ca* in Jaina Devanāgarī). But it could equally be a secondary addition in the Śāradā tradition, and it is this assumption for which I have chosen. In general, it is my impression that the addition of particles, with the aim of facilitating reading, is a very common element of scribal usage in India.[21]

162.15–16. *vināśo virodhaḥ, pratibandhaḥ kvacit | dravyādinā kāryeṇa kāraṇadravyaṃ samavāyyasamavāyikāraṇābhyāṃ ca na virudhyate.* Jambūvijaya places a comma after *pratibandhaḥ* and has no punctuation after *kvacit*. Nozawa translates '**Contradiction** means destruction or obstruction. A substance as a cause is never contradicted by any effect substance, etc., nor is it contradicted either by its inherent cause or by its non-inherent cause' (100a). It seems to me unacceptable to take the *kvacit* together with the *na*, which is so far separated from it in the sentence, as 'never.' If that is ruled out, however, Jambūvijaya's punctuation of the sentence is difficult to retain, for as far as I can see it is not only 'sometimes' that a substance which produces another is not thereby destroyed—there are I believe no exceptions to this rule.[22] For this reason I punctuate after *kvacit* instead, although the resulting word-order is a somewhat unnatural one; one expects rather *vināśo virodhaḥ* (or *virodho vināśaḥ*), *kvacit* (*tu*) *pratibandhaḥ*. Still, it seems possible, the word-order *pratibandhaḥ kvacit* indicating perhaps that the second definition has the nature of an afterthought. Incidentally, the word-order in Jambūvijaya's and Nozawa's analysis is also suspicious—at least I find the structure *definition1 definiendum definition2* with no particles even more unnatural than the same with *kvacit* added as a restriction on the second definition. **1.1.11**

Another possibility to be kept in mind is that the text may not have been transmitted correctly here, although the manuscript tradition is unanimous. The word *pratibandha* does not occur elsewhere in Candrānanda's commentary. Could it have been inserted in the text from a marginal note?

163.5–8. *kāryakāraṇobhayānubhayair avirodhī virodhī ca | paramāṇudvyaṇukādyantyāvayavidravyeṣu rūpādayaḥ kāryobhayakāraṇair avirodhino yathāsambhavam | rūparasagandhasparśā akāryakāraṇabhūtā avirodhinaḥ paraspareṇa | virodhina ādyamadhyāntyaśabdāḥ kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ.* Nozawa translates: **1.1.12**

> '(A quality) is contradicted or not contradicted by both cause and effect or by either one of the two. Color, etc. in atoms and dyads etc. and substances in a state of the final whole are not contradicted by their

[21] Thus in the transmission of the PDhS we frequently find passages where the manuscripts are divided, some having no particle and others differing in which particle(s) they add.

[22] Of course it is precisely this consideration that has almost certainly led Nozawa to his interpretation, which I reject on syntactical grounds and not because of sense.

effects nor by the two kinds of cause (i.e. the inherent cause and the non-inherent cause) respectively. Color, taste, smell and touch, which do not stand in the relation of cause and effect with one another, are not mutually contradicted. Word/sound-s in the first, intermediary and last moments are contradicted by the effect and the two kinds of cause. . . (100a–b)

The initial compound, *kāryakāraṇobhayānubhayaiḥ* is not adequately rendered here; as the various examples show, it is to be taken as a dvandva with four members. Aside from this, there are problems with some of the examples here which Nozawa has not solved satisfactorily. To begin with the three kinds of sound: it seems most improbable that they are destroyed 'by the effect and the two kinds of cause'; this would imply that also the *samavāyikāraṇa* of sound(s), i.e. ether, is a cause of their destruction. Such a view is not to be found elsewhere, and is difficult to make sense of. What one expects is rather that each of the three kinds of sound should be destroyed in a different way, and I propose accordingly that *kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ* be taken as a triple dvandva with its members corresponding respectively (*yathāsaṃkhya*) with *ādyamadhyāntyaśabdāḥ*. The initial sound is destroyed by its effect, the sound that follows it; the sounds in the middle by both the sound they produce and the sound that gave rise to them; the final sound by the sound that preceded it alone.

There is no other place in Candrānanda's commentary which allows us to confirm that this is his opinion on the destruction of the different types of sound; for comparative material we are therefore forced to look elsewhere.[23] In the PDhS we find, as might almost be expected, a statement which agrees closely with Candrānanda's commentary here. The initial sentence in the section on sound mentions the principal characteristics of this quality in Praśastapāda's typical nominal style as follows: *śabdo 'mbaraguṇaḥ śrotragrāhyaḥ kṣaṇikaḥ kāryakāraṇobhayavirodhī saṃyogavibhāgaśabdajaḥ pradeśavṛttiḥ samānāsamānajātīyakāraṇaḥ* (287.17–19). The difference in the order of words in the compound is doubtless to be explained as caused by the fact that unlike Praśastapāda Candrānanda wished the members to correspond respectively with the three types of sound; it confirms that Nozawa is wrong in taking *ubhayakāraṇa* in Candrānanda's compound as a karmadhāraya.[24]

23 I am not aware of any survey in the secondary literature of the various theories of how sound is destroyed that we find in Vaiśeṣika texts.

24 It may be noted here, without digressing too far, that later Vaiśeṣikas, and indeed already Praśastapāda's commentators, do not unanimously agree on the theory which I attribute to Praśastapāda and Candrānanda. For instance, Vyomaśiva, in commenting on the compound *kāryakāraṇobhayavirodhī*, writes *ādyaḥ śabdaḥ kāryeṇa virudhyate, anyas tu kāraṇaṃ virunaddhi*

The interpretation we have arrived at of *kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ* here requires us, I think, also to reject Nozawa's interpretation of *paramāṇudvyaṇukādyantyāvayavidravyeṣu rūpādayaḥ kāryobhayakāraṇair avirodhino yathāsambhavam*. Here too we should rather take the compound as a triple dvandva and apply the *yathāsaṃkhya* principle; colour and so on, as far as they occur/are relevant,[25] are in atoms not destroyed by their effects (one cannot say that they are not destroyed by their causes, for they are eternal[26] and have no causes), in dyads and other intermediate substances they are destroyed neither by their effects (the corresponding colour and so on that they produce in substances built out of the dyads and so on) nor their causes, and in final wholes, substances that do not produce yet further ones, they have no effects and are not destroyed by their causes.

163.9. *jñānaṃ saṃskārasantānapratipakṣaiḥ.* Nozawa 'knowledge is contradicted by counteracting factors to the continuance of latent impulse' (100b). This seems an unlikely interpretation to me. The factors mentioned in the PDhS and other Vaiśeṣika texts as destroying cognitions do not include 'counteracting factors' to the succession of mental traces (indeed I have not seen any reference to such factors). Instead the mental traces themselves are in some contexts mentioned as causing the destruction of cognitions; see, for instance, from the complex discussion of numbers in the PDhS, *tadanantaraṃ dravyajñānād*[27] *dvitvaguṇabuddher vināśaḥ,* ***dravyabuddher api saṃskārāt*** (111.22–112.1). The sentence should therefore rather be understood as saying that cognition is destroyed by mental traces and/or factors opposed to the stream of cognitions, i.e. which cut it off. An instance of the latter would be liberation, or correct knowledge which cuts off a particular succession of false cognitions.[28]

madhyagatās tu kāryeṇa virudhyante kāraṇaṃ ca virundhantīti (Vyo[2] vol. 2 241.26–28). This is a clear distortion of Praśastapāda's intention: it amounts to saying that the first and all intermediate sounds are all destroyed by their effects alone. How the final sound is destroyed is not made clear, but apparently not by its predecessor. Śrīdhara on the other hand is faithful to the original sense: *ādyaḥ śabdaḥ svakāryeṇa virudhyate | antyaḥ svakāraṇenopāntyaśabdena virudhyate, anyasya vināśakāraṇasyābhāvāt | madhyavartinas tūbhayathā virudhyante* (NK[2] 637.13–15). Still other views are attested in later literature, but interesting though the point is, this would lead us too far from our topic.

25 This is closer in my opinion to the sense Candrānanda wishes to convey with *yathāsambhavam* than Nozawa's 'respectively.' *rūpādayaḥ* is of course a designation under which all qualities could fall, though it is probably the four first qualities that Candrānanda has in mind. Even those do not however all occur in each type of substance mentioned here.

26 With the exception of course of the qualities produced by 'cooking' in earth-atoms alone, and numbers higher than one which may be produced in them by the *apekṣābuddhi* of God or other extraordinary souls capable of perceiving them.

27 Note that this word is not unanimously transmitted, some editions (and manuscripts) having *dravyasāmānyād* instead (cf. Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994, 23 n. 17).

28 For the latter cf. e.g. Vyomaśiva's *yathā hi samyagjñānān mithyājñānasya santānocchedaḥ,*

1.1.18 **165.9–10**. *saṃyogānāṃ dravyam* (1.1.25) *ity agnisaṃyogād guṇāntaraprādurbhāvād* (cf. 7.1.5–6) *ity ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karma* (5.1.1)[29] *iti vākyebhyaḥ saṃyoga eva dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ samānaṃ kāraṇaṃ nānyo guṇaḥ*. It should at least be noted that the citation of 7.1.5–6 is not exactly in the form in which we seem to find those sūtras later at their proper place in the text, (*agnisaṃyogāc ca* 7.1.5, *guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt* 7.1.6) and that there is but a single *iti* allotted to the two; whether there are any conclusions that can or should be drawn from this I do not know. Nozawa omits through oversight to translate the quotation of 5.1.1.

1.1.21 **166.5–6**. *tatra na tāvat karma svāśraye karmakāraṇam, niṣkriyadravyānupalabdhiprasaṅgāt*. None of the manuscripts transmits the *na*, but a negation is clearly required. Jambūvijaya supplies a *na* (in square brackets) before *svāśraye*; I have chosen to do so at what I feel is a slightly more natural place. There being no very clear reason why the negation should have been lost, in either position, one might also think of conjecturing *tan na* for *tatra*, which would at least have the advantage that the error could be explained easily as confusion of similar *akṣaras*; it could then very well have occurred independently in the two lines of transmission. However I believe the partitive *tatra* is what is needed at the beginning of this sentence, and find *tat* unnatural. If I am right, the omission of *na* would appear to be archetypal.

1.1.27 **167.8–9**. *ādityaraśmīnām agurutvāt parvatasya tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāl loṣṭasya ca hastenāsaṃyuktatvād anutkṣepaṇam iti gurutvādīnām utkṣepaṇaṃ samānaṃ kāryam*. For *parvatasya* the manuscript tradition unanimously reads *parvate*, which is adopted by Jambūvijaya. It cannot be accepted, however; three different reasons are given why an object cannot have the motion *utkṣepaṇa*, and for each an example is given of a particular substance to which it may apply. All three examples must be in the genitive case, which depends on *anutkṣepaṇam*. The error is clearly archetypal—it is not likely to have occurred independently—and results perhaps from a scribe failing to grasp the structure of the sentence and substituting a locative because the genitive does not yield good sense if one allows it to depend (as *genetivus subjectivus*) on the following *tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāt* or because a locative was expected to express the object of the *prayatna*. Nozawa translates the entire sentence as follows: 'Throwing upwards does not occur in the sun beams because they have no weight; nor in a mountain, because such things have no volition; nor in a lump of clay, because it is not conjunct with a hand' (102a); he does not comment on the locative. Leaving aside trivial matters, his translation of *tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāt* as 'because such things have no volition'

naivaṃ mithyājñānāt samyagjñānasyeti (Vyo[2] vol. 1 3.3–4).

29 I have dissolved the vowel-sandhi with the following *iti* in the transliteration.

is clearly incorrect. None of the objects involved has volition, as that is of course a quality which souls alone can have. What is meant must be that such a volition or effort, i.e. the will to lift up a mountain and, by implication, the strength to do so,[30] does not occur, in ordinary mortals at least. This, not the absence of weight or of conjunction with the hand, is the reason why a mountain cannot be thrown upward.

167.12. *kāraṇasāmānye dravyakarmaṇāṃ karmākāraṇam uktam*| 1.1.29. I deviate from Jambūvijaya by removing the *iti* that is found after this in all the manuscripts. This is probably a scribal addition, marking the end of the *āhnika*. The manuscripts are irregular in adding such *iti*s; here they are admittedly unanimous but at the end of *āhnika* 2 of *adhyāya* 1, for instance, J_1^s (alone) does not have one. The only place at which Candrānanda clearly knew and accepted an *iti* in this position is at the end of the VS, in 10.21, on which sūtra he briefly remarks *itiśabdaḥ samāptyarthaḥ* (76.13); had he also regarded *iti*s at the end of other sections as belonging to the text one would expect some comment there too, especially as in such places it is less obvious that the word is *samāptyarthaḥ* than it is at the very end of the entire work. I may note that it is an apparently quite common occurrence for an *iti* which one expects to belong to the colophon to be actually placed before the *daṇḍa* or double *daṇḍa* marking the end of the text; this phenomenon occurs even in manuscripts of works in verse, where metrical considerations make it obvious (presumably also to the scribe) that the word does not belong to the text proper. **1.1.29**

168.1. *kāryakāraṇaśabdau pūrvam uktau*| *tannirūpaṇārtham āha*. In all the manuscripts this is placed after 1.2.1, and this order is retained by Jambūvijaya. As Nozawa points out (113a n. 58), however, it clearly has the nature of an *avataraṇa* for the sūtra, so I follow his proposal to transpose it to its natural place. An interesting case of an error shared by all the manuscripts, and one which may point to the fact that the sūtra text embedded in the commentary has not always been transmitted with it. Instead, at some point in the transmission pre-dating the archetype of all our manuscripts, the sūtras may have been added to the commentary, which could have had *pratīka*s alone, for instance.[31] **1.2.1**

30 Note that strength is not mentioned separately, as far as I can see, as a necessary factor in 'throwing upwards,' neither in the sūtras, in Candrānanda's commentary nor in the PDhS. To some extent I suspect that it is subsumed under *prayatna*, although that is a quality of the soul and not a physical one.

31 Cf. Srinivasan's remarks on the different ways in which the verses of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* are transmitted in the manuscripts of the *Tattvakaumudī* (1967, 44–47). His observation that the manuscripts differ widely in the way the verses are quoted or incorporated applies to the tradition of several other texts I am familiar with as well, e.g. to that of Vallabhadeva's commentary on the *Raghuvaṃśa*.

1.2.3 **168.7.** *uktā ānuṣaṅgikāḥ sāmānyādayas trayaḥ padārthāḥ.* The Śāradā manuscripts omit *trayaḥ*, and it is not impossible that the word is a secondary addition. But it is equally possible that it has been lost in the hyparchetype of the Ś manuscripts, as a result perhaps of eyeskip between two *yas*. The matter cannot be settled; I have allowed myself to be influenced by the *saṇṇāṃ padārthānām* unanimously transmitted in the commentary on 1.1.6 and again ad 8.1 (62.4).

1.2.9 **169.15–170.1.** *ekadravyatvān na dravyam* || 1.2.9 *dravyam adravyam paramāṇvākāśādi kāraṇadravyābhāvāt, anekadravyaṃ vā ghaṭādi samavāyikāraṇadravyayuktatvāt.* The sūtra aims at offering an argument to prove that the highest universal 'reality' (*sattā*) cannot be reckoned under the category substance. The two translations we have of this *āhnika* differ in their interpretation of the sūtra: Nozawa translates '(Beingness is) not a substance because of having one substance' (103a) and Halbfass 'It is not a substance, because it occurs in single (ultimate) substances' (1992, 240). In my view Nozawa comes appreciably closer to the intended sense here; if Halbfass' translation were correct the argument would be a very poor one. For there are substances, namely dyads (*dvyaṇukas*), which 'occur in,' i.e. inhere in, ultimate substances, i.e. two atoms. So 'occurring in single (ultimate) substances' would, by the Vaiśeṣika's own presuppositions, not be a valid *hetu* by which one could infer that 'reality' is not a substance.

What is more, there are good reasons to think that Halbfass' understanding of *ekadravya* as 'single (ultimate) substance' is wrong. We have strong evidence that it was an axiom already in early Vaiśeṣika that substances can be of two kinds: *adravya* and *anekadravya*. The former group is that of substances which have no *samavāyikāraṇa*, i.e. the same as those which Halbfass takes as being referred to by the term *ekadravya*. The second comprises all compound substances: even the most basic of these, the dyads, inhere in more than a single substance. There are therefore no substances at all that inhere in (i.e. have as *samavāyikāraṇa*) exactly one substance. In other words, anything which does or can have a single substance as *samavāyikāraṇa* may on that ground be concluded not to be a substance: this is the argument that the sūtra in my opinion intends to express. All of these compounds—*adravya*, *anekadravya* and *ekadravya*—are to be taken as bahuvrīhis, not as karmadhārayas, as Halbfass evidently does with *ekadravya*.

As a first illustration of this, we may turn to the opening of Candrānanda's commentary on our sūtra. Here I have felt compelled to conjecture a reading not found in any of the manuscripts. For *dravyam adravyam paramāṇvākāśādi kāraṇadravyābhāvāt* Jambūvijaya prints *paramāṇvākāśādidravyam adravyam kāraṇadravyābhāvāt*; this is essentially the reading of J_1, though one feels inclined to divide *paramāṇvākāśādidravyam* into two words: *paramāṇvākāśādi dravyam*. Nozawa translates: 'Substances like atoms, space/ether and so on have

no substance, because there is no substance as their cause. (Substances in a state of effect like) a pot, etc. have many substances, because they are connected to the substances, i.e. their inherent cause' (103a), and Halbfass: 'A (single ultimate) substance, such as an atom or ether, is without (underlying) substance, because there is no substance that would be its (material) cause. And a (composite substance), for instance a pot, occurs in (i.e., consists of) more than one substance, because it is combined with those substances which are its inherential causes (*samavāyikāraṇa*)' (1992, 240–241). Neither scholar comments on the text, but both clearly have difficulties with it, Nozawa having for example no equivalent for the *vā* and Halbfass apparently rendering it with 'and.'

My emendation of the passage is based in part on Candrānanda's commentary on 2.2.27. The latter sūtra is identical in reading to 1.2.9; it is intended to argue, on the same grounds we have here, that sound is not a substance. Candrānanda writes: *ekasmin dravya ākāśe vartamānatvān na dravyam ayaṃ śabdaḥ* | ***dravyaṃ hy adravyam paramāṇvādi, anekadravyaṃ vā ghaṭādi.***[32] It is precisely such an explanation, and structure, that we need here. I believe that *paramāṇvākāśādi* has been displaced in the archetype (perhaps via an omission that was corrected in the margin and than re-inserted at the wrong place), so that the *vā* no longer could be easily construed. As a result, perhaps, the text underwent further change in the line of transmission leading up to the hyparchetype of the Śāradā manuscripts, with among other things the *vā* being altered to *yadi*. The final product of this, the sentence *paramāṇvākāśādi dravyaṃ sad dravyam adravyaṃ kāraṇadravyābhāvāt, anekadravyaṃ yadi ghaṭādi samavāyikāraṇadravyayuktatvāt* (reading with $Ś_2$, as the *samavāyakāraṇadravyayuktatvāt* of $Ś_1$ and $Ś_3$ is clearly a further error), seems however to remain virtually incoherent.

The axiom that the sūtras and Candrānanda make use of is also found quoted as an authoritative Vaiśeṣika dictum in other texts. The *Vyomavatī*, to start with, explains that a compound earth substance does not exist in a single substance that produces it, using the following words: *tathā**dravyaṃ dravyam, anekadravyaṃ ca dravyam** iti vacanavyāghātaḥ* | *tathā hi—na vidyate janyaṃ janakaṃ ca dravyam ity adravyam* | *paramāṇūnāṃ janakaṃ nāsti* | *ākāśādīnāṃ janyaṃ nāpi janakam ity adravyaṃ nityadravyam iti yāvat* | *anekadravyaṃ tv anekadravyaṃ janakam asyety anena svarūpeṇa* | *dvividham eva dravyam, adravyaṃ nityam anekadravyaṃ janyaṃ kāryam iti* | *ekadravyasya ca kāryadravyasyābhyupagame vyā-*

32 Also relevant is Candrānanda's commentary on 2.1.11, *adravyavattvād dravyam*, which runs *yaḥ paramāṇusvabhāvo vāyuḥ sa khalv adravyavattvāt samavāyikāraṇarahitatvād dravyam* | ***dravyaṃ hy adravyam anekadravyaṃ ca***. Note the use of *adravyavattvāt*, where *adravyatvāt* could convey the same sense. It seems intended to avoid any ambiguity on how to understand the compound *adravya*; cf. also p. 243 below, with reference to the readings of compounds of this type in the *sūtrapāṭha* found in the Ahmedabad manuscript.

hatam etad bhavatīti (Vyo[2] vol. 2 74.9–15). In some respects I find Vyomaśiva's
comments here unnatural—on the oldest level I think *adravya* and so on was meant
to refer merely to the *samavāyikāraṇa* (i.e. *janaka*) and not also the product (*janya*).
But Vyomaśiva's understanding still is not radically different: the important thing
is that substances can only fall into these two categories and that they correspond
to eternal and compound, impermanent substances respectively.

The *Yuktidīpikā* provides another testimonium. In attempting to refute the Vai-
śeṣika theory with regard to the compound whole (*avayavin*) being distinct from
its parts, the author of this text maintains, *inter alia*, that if the whole exists in a
single part, the Vaiśeṣika *śāstra*, by which a specific text could perhaps be meant,
would be contradicted: *tataś ca yac chāstraṃ* ***dravyam anekadravyam adravyaṃ***
vā tasya hāniḥ (50.17–18). The context here thus resembles that of the *Vyoma-*
vatī reference. Similarly, in arguing against the existence of God, the *Yuktidīpikā*
again tries to use the Vaiśeṣika's own principle against it: *tan na tāvad dravyādibhā-*
taḥ | kasmāt | ***dvividhaṃ hi dravyam anekadravyam adravyaṃ ca*** *tatra nāneka-*
dravyam īśvaraḥ, kṛtakādidoṣaprasaṅgāt | nādravyam, parisaṃkhyānāt pṛthivyā-
dīni manaḥparyantāni navaiva dravyāṇīti vaḥ siddhāntaḥ, itikaraṇasya parisamā-
ptyarthatvāt (72.24–26).[33]

Other references to the same principle are not hard to find. I shall cite one fi-
nal example, from Guṇaratnasūri's *Tarkarahasyadīpikā*, a commentary on the Jaina
doxographical treatise *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* by Haribhadra. After a brief account
of the substances according to the Vaiśeṣika, Guṇaratnasūri remarks: *idaṃ ca na-*
*vavidham api dravyaṃ sāmānyato dvedhā—****adravyaṃ dravyam anekadravyaṃ ca***
dravyam *| tatrādravyam ākāśakāladigātmamanaḥparamāṇavaḥ kāraṇadravyānā-*
rabdhatvāt | anekadravyaṃ tu dvyaṇukādiskandhāḥ (411.3–5 §469).

1.2.13 **170.13–14**. *dravyādiṣv iva dravyatvādīnāṃ madhyāt kaścit sāmānyaviśeṣo dravya-*
tve varteta yadi dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karma vā syāt | tasmān na dravyādīni dravyatvam.
Jambūvijaya conjecturally adds *dravyatvaṃ* (in square brackets) after *yadi*. This is
possible, and the word could of course easily have been lost either in the archetype
or independently in both recensions due to eyeskip (homoeoarcton), but the conjec-
ture is superfluous and the resulting construction almost over-explicit, as it is per-
fectly clear what the subject is. It is true that the commentary on 1.2.15 begins *yadi*
guṇatvaṃ dravyaṃ karma vā syāt, but there the subject has not already occurred
as it has here (admittedly not as a nominative); a fairer comparison would be with
the commentary on 1.2.17: *dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ vā karmatve syātāṃ yadi dra-*
vyaṃ guṇo vā syāt, where Jambūvijaya does not make the parallel conjecture *yadi*
karmatvaṃ *dravyaṃ guṇo vā syāt*. Of course in this latter case there would be no

33 Both of these *Yuktidīpikā* passages, together with a few more from the same text which bear
upon Vaiśeṣika, are discussed in Motegi 1995.

plausible cause of mechanical omission.

170.16. *guṇeṣu guṇānām avṛtter guṇatvaṃ ca guṇeṣu vartate tasmān na guṇaḥ*. The construction is anacolouthic, but may be what Candrānanda wrote. I choose to let the sentence stand; the chief alternative would be to conjecturally read *guṇeṣu guṇānām avṛtter guṇatvasya ca guṇeṣu vṛtter na guṇo guṇatvam* (cf. the commentary on 1.2.16). **1.2.14**

171.9. *salliṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ* || 1.2.18. As in 1.1.29, I regard the *iti* transmitted in all sources save J_1^S as not truly belonging to the sūtra (cf. p. 191 above). **1.2.18**

172.6. *sparśo 'syā anuṣṇāśītatve sati pākajaḥ*. The *sati* is not present in the Śāradā manuscripts, and one could reason that it is more likely to have been supplied then omitted. I have assumed however that this is not the case, and that Candrānanda is once again literally quoting the PDhS (27.17); as far as I am presently aware the *sati* is unanimously transmitted in Praśastapāda's work. **2.1.1**

172.9. *śuklamadhuraśītā eva rūparasasparśāḥ*. Nozawa translates 'The colour is white. The taste is sweet. The touch is cool' (104a); he points out (113b n. 78) that the sentence is (again) lifted from the PDhS (35.24–36.1). The *eva* is significant enough that it should really have been translated; as is pointed out by the commentators on the PDhS it is to be understood with each equation. Thus Śrīdhara for instance remarks *śuklam eva rūpam apām, madhura eva rasaḥ, śīta eva sparśaḥ* | *apsu rūpāntarapratītir āśrayarūpabhedāt* (NK² 109.8–9). The explicit limitation forms a marked contrast with the much more variegated qualities of earth, as taught by Candrānanda in the commentary on the preceding 2.1.1. **2.1.2**

173.1. *anuṣṇāśīto 'pākajaḥ sparśaḥ*. Thus J_1 and Jambūvijaya; the Śāradā manuscripts read *anuṣṇāśīto sya pākajaḥ sparśaḥ*. This cannot be correct, of course, but the reading that no doubt lies behind it, *anuṣṇāśīto 'syāpākajaḥ sparśaḥ*, is one which cannot be rejected out of hand. In its favour, so it could be argued, is the fact that the corresponding sentence in the PDhS runs *sparśo 'syānuṣṇāśītatve saty apākajaḥ* (44.2–3). If we thus correct the Ś reading, therefore, the correspondence with the PDhS is slightly greater; note that a demonstrative pronoun in the genitive would be present in exactly the same two cases (the commentary ad 2.1.1 = earth and ad 2.1.4 = fire) as in the PDhS. If Candrānanda's sentence here had been closer in structure to that in the PDhS, with an absolute locative, I would certainly have succumbed to the temptation to emend in this way; as it is the balance may equally well be allowed to tip the other way. **2.1.4**

173.6–7. *sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānāṃ pārthivānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ* **2.1.6**

sāmānyam] 2.1.6. Nozawa renders: 'The fluidity of earthen (substances), such as clarified butter, lac and wax, (which is) due to the conjunction with fire, is similar to that of water' (104b).[34] As is born out, in my opinion, by some of the parallel passages which Nozawa himself quotes, it would be better to translate '... is a similarity [of earth] with water'; cf. for instance, from the section of the PDhS where similarities between various groups of substances are listed, *kṣititejasor naimittikadravatvayogaḥ* (25.24). The same observation holds for Nozawa's translation of the following sūtra; despite this, in the commentary to both sūtras he does translates *samānatvam*, clearly equivalent with *sāmānyam*, 'similarity.'

2.1.8 **173.13–14**. *viṣāṇī kakudmān prāntevāladhiḥ sāsnāvān iti gotve dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgam*. 2.1.8. Note the interesting reading of the Śāradā manuscripts: *viṣāṇī kakudmān* ***vṛṣabhaḥ*** *prāntevāladhiḥ sāsnāvān* ***galacarmaṇā lakṣyata*** *iti* ***gotvaṃ*** *dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgam*. There is nothing in the commentary or in other recensions of the VS to support these additions and changes; the added words could perhaps have entered the text from marginal annotations.

174.1. *gotvam iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*. Clearly this sentence of the commentary is meant to explain the word *gotva*, which occurs in the sūtra in the locative. The manuscripts all seem to have *gotva iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*, which Jambūvijaya interprets and prints as *'gotve' iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*. But the lack of concord between the word in the *pratīka* and the gloss is, as far as I know, very abnormal; one expects either that both be in the nominative or both in the same case in which the word glossed occurs in the sūtra, i.e. the locative. No comment on this is made by Nozawa, who translates '**Being a cow** (i.e. cowhood) means an individual cow defined by cowhood' (104b), in other words as if the lemma too were in the nominative. Wezler (1984, 459) also cites the text as printed by Jambūvijaya without comment. Nonetheless, I have decided to take the step presupposed by Nozawa's translation and conjecture *gotvam iti* for the transmitted *gotva iti*. The alteration is not a large one, especially if we bear in mind that the archetype (or an even earlier state of the text) may have written *gotvaṃ iti*; admittedly irregular sandhi, but not uncommon in manuscripts.[35] The *anusvāra* would then be at a high risk of being lost, both mechanically and due to a scribe's memory of the locative in the sūtra (the latter possibility is fainter in the Ś manuscripts, since they read *gotvaṃ*

34 Roughly similar, though with slightly different infelicities, is Honda's translation of the sūtra: 'The fluidity of earthern clarified butter, lac and wax, through conjunction with fire, is same with that of water' (1990, 159(14)).

35 An instance may be found in the critical apparatus of Candrānanda's commentary on 1.1.1, where we find for the accepted and surely correct *dharma iti* the following distribution of readings in the Śāradā manuscripts: *dharma iti* Ś2, ***dharmam iti*** Ś1, *dharmam iti* Ś3. It is probable that the hyparchetype had *dharmam iti*; this was faithfully retained in Ś1, correctly emended in Ś2 and 'normalized' in Ś3 (leaving a wrong reading).

rather than *gotve* in the sūtra). In fact there are what might be traces of an erased *anusvāra* on the *tva* in J_1, though these could also be purely accidental blotches.

175.8. *nanu ca.* Perhaps it is worth noting that Candrānanda uses both *nanu* and *nanu ca* regularly to introduce an objection that is to be refuted thereafter (though the combination is of significantly less frequent occurrence),[36] in view of the fact that Wezler has expressed the opinion that the use of *nanu ca* in the *Pātañjalayogaśā-stravivaraṇa* to introduce an objection 'might be an idiosyncracy.'[37] I can detect no nuance in the choice for the one or the other. **2.1.15**

175.11. *yathāyaṃ gaur iti goś cakṣuṣā sannikarṣe sati pratyakṣeṇa viṣāṇādīni tadyogitayā dṛṣṭāni kadācil liṅgaṃ naivaṃ tvacā vāyoḥ sannikarṣe saty ayaṃ vāyur iti pratyakṣeṇa tadguṇatayā sparśa upalabdho yenānupalabhyamānaṃ kadācid vāyum anumāpayet.* Nozawa's translation runs as follows.

> When a cow and the eyes are in contact, horns, etc. are observed belonging to it together with the perception that this is a cow. These (horns etc.) become an inferential mark sometime or other. Unlike this, when the skin and wind are in contact, there is no perception of touch as its quality together with the perception that this is wind. How could this imperceptible wind be inferred from such a mark (as touch when it is not certain whether it belongs to the wind)? (105b)

Some of the infelicities here are perhaps to be put down to Japanese English and others to the attempt to translate somewhat freely. But aside from that, I find the translation of *pratyakṣeṇa* (twice) as 'together with the perception' unlikely; rather than a sociative, I think it is to be taken with *dṛṣṭāni* and *upalabdhaḥ* respectively.

175.14–15. *kṣityādisparśavilakṣaṇadharmatvād asya sparśasya nirāśrayasya cābhāvād vāyur āśraya iti cet.* The reading °*vilakṣaṇadharmatvād asya* is a conjecture; J_1 reads °*vidharmatvād asya*, which is what Jambūvijaya prints. **2.1.16**

36 For what it is worth, I can offer the following collection (all references are to page and line number in Jambūvijaya's edition): *nanu* without *ca* occurs at 16.15, 18.1, 19.7, 19.8, 23.7, 31.6, 35.8, 49.15, 58.1, 58.8 and 60.13, while *nanu ca* occurs aside from the instance here also at 29.8, 30.1 and 60.1.

37 To quote Wezler's remarks in more detail: apropos of the question of the authorship of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* he writes 'interest will then have to be focussed primarily on expressions, phrases, etc., that do not directly belong to what may be called philosophical and technical terminology, e.g. the most frequent, almost continual introduction, in the Vivaraṇa, of an objection with *nanu ca*; now this might be an idiosyncrasy; and since it also belongs to those idiomatic elements which are philosophically irrelevant and are beyond the range of conscious control, it could contribute to prove the identity of the two authors assumed by Hacker if it were to occur with equal persistence at least in the earlier works of Śaṅkara the Advaitin' (1983b, 36).

Jambūvijaya fails however to report in his apparatus that his sole Śāradā manuscript indicates a damaged or lacunose original with four dashes after °*vi*°; this is confirmed by the other Śāradā manuscripts. Aside from this, the word *vidharma* is in itself suspicious. Nozawa translates Jambūvijaya's text as follows: '(Reply) This touch is different from those of earth, etc. and cannot be without any substratum. Therefore wind is the substratum. (Thus the existence of wind is established)' (105b).[38] The sense 'different' attributed here to *vidharma* is indeed the one needed in the context, but if I am not mistaken it is not attested: *vidharma* seems only to be used elsewhere in the sense of 'wrong, contrary to *dharma*.' The word does not occur in the rest of Candrānanda's commentary. What is really wanted, therefore, is what I have conjectured, *vilakṣaṇa*, a common word regularly used by Candrānanda.[39] I feel that this has a high probability of being correct. One might only wonder perhaps whether Candrānanda wrote °*vilakṣaṇadharmatvāt* or °*vilakṣaṇatvāt*; the compound *vilakṣaṇadharma* does not occur in the rest of the work. But it is quite natural, and seems to fit the context well enough, so I have decided to retain the *dharma* which is after all attested in all the witnesses.

Since the loss of the *akṣaras* °*lakṣaṇa*° is not likely to have occurred independently, I suspect that the archetype was damaged here. The hyparchetype of the Śāradā manuscripts, then, probably indicated the lacuna with dashes, and these were taken over by its three descendents, whereas J_1 or a lost intermediate manuscript omitted to mark the lacuna.

176.3–5. *vibhūnāṃ sparśavattve bhāvānāṃ pratighāta iti cet—evaṃ tarhi vāyor evāyaṃ bhavatprasiddhasya sparśo na daśamasya dravyasyeti kathaṃ jñāyate.* The opponent has just suggested that the touch which the *siddhāntin* claims belongs to wind and allows us to infer the existence of wind could in fact belong to another imperceptible substance such as ether. Nozawa: '(Reply) It is denied that omnipresent substances (such as space/ether etc.) have touch. (Objection) How, then, is it known that this touch belongs only to the well-known substance, wind, and not to the tenth substance.' I would propose rather something like 'If [the *siddhāntin* objects to the *pūrvapakṣin* by urging:] if all-pervasive substances possess touch [they would always offer] resistence to [other] elements of existence [i.e. ordinary ones with form; therefore the touch that we feel without perceiving a substance cannot belong to them], [the *pūrvapakṣin* replies:] Then [if things are admitted to be] thus, [still] how does one know that this touch [can] belong only to the well-known [substance] wind, and not to a tenth substance?' If ether and so on

38 Apparently the '(Reply)' at the start of the sentence in translation is Nozawa's rendering of *iti cet*, which here does indeed mark an objection by the Vaiśeṣika *siddhāntin* to the objection of the *pūrvapakṣa* which starts from the *nanu ca* introducing 2.1.15.

39 Found, besides this passage, at 16.8, 16.12, 35.10 (2×), 57.5, 72.16 and 72.19.

had touch, we would constantly feel resistence from them, as they are all-pervasive and thus constantly in conjunction with all existing things.

There is a textual choice to be made here too, though perhaps not one that affects the sense. For *bhāvānāṃ pratighāta* (as in the Śāradā manuscripts, followed by Jambūvijaya) J_3 has *bhāvapratighāta*. Either reading could be original, but secondary compounding may be a little more likely, partly to avoid the ambiguity of two genetive plurals with different referents close to each other.[40]

176.10–11. *asmadādīnāṃ sakāśād yo bhagavān vijñānādibhir viśiṣṭo maheśvaras tadīyaṃ saṃjñāpraṇayanaṃ navānām eva dravyāṇāṃ bhāve liṅgaṃ daśamasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt | tasmān navaiva dravyāṇi.* Nozawa translates: **2.1.18**

> The name-giving of *Maheśvara* who is superior to us as regards wisdom, etc. is the mark for the inference that substances are only nine in number. The name of the tenth substance is not known. Accordingly, substances are nine only. (105b)

Again, ignoring minor matters, one must at least object to the rendering of *daśamasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt*, though the problem may be mainly a question of English. Rather 'because the name of a tenth [substance] has not been taught.' Nozawa does not refer to the parallel in the PDhS: *tatra dravyāṇi pṛthivyaptejovāyvākāśakāladigātmamanāṃsi sāmānyaviśeṣasaṃjñayoktāni navaiveti, tadvyatirekeṇ**ānyasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt*** (8.9–11).

179.7–8. *yathā salliṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāva evaṃ śabdaliṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgā-bhāvāc caikam ākāśam.* The Śāradā manuscripts have *viśeṣaliṅgābhāvād eko* instead of *viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc ca*. This is the *lectio difficilior*, and indeed there is no good reason why the *ca* should have been omitted. Nonetheless, like Jambūvijaya I suppose, I see equally no reason why Candrānanda should have omitted the word, and in 1.2.18, to which it is clear that our commentator refers, all witnesses testify to the presence of a *ca*. **2.1.28**

I agree with Jambūvijaya in assuming that the *iti* at the end of the sentence in all the manuscripts is rather to be taken as belonging to the colophon, in spite of actually being written before the double *daṇḍa*; cf. also the remarks ad 1.1.29 on p. 191 above.

40 Srinivasan, speaking of the same problem of deciding between compounded and uncompounded readings, expresses the opinion that 'Fälle, in denen sich sekundäre Flektierung motivieren ließe, etwa dahingehend daß durch die Flektierung das Gemeinte klarer würde, sind sehr selten. In vielen Fällen sicher, auf jeden Fall aber durchweg wahrscheinlich, ist in diesem Variantenbereich vielmehr nur, daß Überlieferer flektierte Formen zusammensetzten, und zwar nicht absichtlich, sondern unwillkürlich' (1967, 36 §1.4.5.10).

PART III

THE *sūtrapāṭha* MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VS

3.1 Introduction

The importance of studying manuscripts of the VS alone, i.e. without a commentary, has been justly emphasized by Wezler in his article on the definition of yoga in the VS (1982, see especially p. 645). The 'indispensable examination of all the MSS of the VS' which Wezler called for (op. cit. loc. cit.) remains however, and is likely to remain for some time yet, an unfulfilled desideratum, but efforts have been made to examine as many such manuscripts as could be found, and the more interesting results of this examination are presented in this part.[1]

To the best of my knowledge, the only two scholars who have published information on manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS without a commentary are Gopinath Kaviraj and Anantalal Thakur.[2] In a brief article which was published as long ago as 1929, but which has been perhaps somewhat undeservedly neglected,[3] Gopinath Kaviraj reports on 'an apparently very old manuscript (undated) of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtras,' from a private collection in Benares.[4] Kaviraj noticed that the text of this manuscript contained 'several differences from the current text' (i.e. the text as commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra) and in his article gives, so he says, the differences. Regrettably, a complete transcript of this manuscript was never published,[5] and its present whereabouts are not known to me—it is not unlikely that it will never be traced. We must therefore rely solely on Kaviraj's collation, the

1 Some of these results are published in preliminary form in Isaacson 1995 (especially sections I, II and III). In case of any discrepancy between statements or proposals found there and those made here, the latter are to be taken as representing my revised opinions.

2 Their relevant publications are also referred to by Wezler in the article which was quoted above: see p. 643–644, note 3 on p. 674, and n. 8 on p. 675.

3 Thus Nozawa's useful *Comparative Table of the Vaiśesikasūtra* (1985), for instance, does not report the divergent readings Kaviraj quoted in this article.

4 Kaviraj 1929, 71. The name of the owner of the collection is not given because, as it appears, he wished to remain anonymous.

5 Kaviraj tells us that he was able to use the manuscript for a few days only (op. cit. [illegible]

completeness of which is uncertain at best. It is noteworthy that in several cases the reported text contains lacunae, and it seems therefore very likely that also in cases where Kaviraj found no clear difference from Śaṃkara Miśra's text to note, the manuscript may have been in fact damaged or illegible. When Kaviraj does not give a variant reading from the manuscript, therefore, we cannot always conclude that it read as does Śaṃkara Miśra.[6]

Anantalal Thakur is perhaps the scholar who has gone to the most trouble to examine manuscripts of the VS and its commentaries, as well as to exert himself laudably in the work of editing. The amount of concrete information on this subject that can be gained from his publications is, however, rather disappointing. According to an article with the title *Textual Problems of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras*, published in 1963, Thakur had at that time 'collated the sūtra-readings from six printed editions and sixteen Manuscripts preserved in different Manuscript Libraries.'[7] Unfortunately, Thakur does not give details of the manuscripts he collated, not to speak of their readings. The sentence immediately following on the one quoted also has a confusing rather than an enlightening effect; Thakur says that '[a]mong them two have subsequently formed the basis of the editions of the *Vaiśeṣikadarśana* published by the Mithila Institute, Darbhanga and the Oriental Institute, Baroda.' The two editions referred to must of course be Thakur's own edition of the VS with the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary and Muni Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, respectively (see parts 1 and 2 of this thesis). But since two manuscripts were used by Jambūvijaya and one by Thakur, these two editions are based on three rather than two manuscripts, as Thakur states here. Furthermore, it appears from this that the sixteen manuscripts mentioned include manuscripts of the VS together with commentaries, which leaves it unclear how many manuscripts containing only the *sūtrapāṭha* were in fact collated. Nor can it be excluded that the manuscripts Thakur referred to included some of the VS together with Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary.

Earlier, in the introduction to his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, Thakur had stated that '[t]he known manuscripts of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras are not numerous. They generally represent the Maithila version just mentioned.'[8] Here too, Thakur unfortunately gives no information as to

6 I refrain here from an attempt to extract what information we can from Kaviraj's article and to evaluate the manuscript he quotes from, although this might be well worth the effort. Let me just remark that, from the rather limited information given, it seems that this recension, if it is a separate one, is closer to that followed by Śaṃkara Miśra than any other.

7 Thakur 1963a, 187.

8 This remark is found on p. 11 of the English introduction. The corresponding passage in the Sanskrit *bhūmikā* reads *upalabhyamānāḥ sūtramātṛkās tu prāyaśo maithilapāṭhānusāriṇyaḥ* (p. 24).

the exceptions which he implies exist, and once more the possibility cannot perhaps be excluded that Thakur had in mind manuscripts giving the text of the VS together with commentaries (for instance those of Candrānada—at the time known of but not published—and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) as well as manuscripts of the *sūtrapāṭha* alone.[9] In short, Thakur's publications prove to give disappointingly little concrete information as to manuscripts which give a *sūtrapāṭha* alone and differ from the text followed by Śaṃkara Miśra. The hope need not yet be given up that Thakur one day will give us more details, or even publish the critical edition he had been planning, or else collations of all the manuscripts he has examined, but as the years pass, the chance of this happening becomes ever slimmer.

My examination of manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* without a commentary has confirmed Thakur's remark as to the prevalence of the version commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra,[10] but two manuscripts I have been able to collate have proved interesting exceptions. Both contain texts which differ from the known recensions of the VS, as well as being mutually quite different. A brief report on these two versions may be found in Isaacson 1995, sections II and III). Here I present the full text of the VS as transmitted in these two manuscripts, providing a diplomatic edition and a tentative reconstruction of the presumed hyparchetype of both, followed by an attempt at evaluation. Clearly a diplomatic transcription was desired, since each is at present the only known transmitter of its particular VS recension, and without the aid of other witnesses and especially a commentary based on these particular versions a 'critical edition' is hardly a possibility. At the same time, both have numerous errors which can be identified as scribal, so that it is possible, and surely desirable, to correct the text to some extent. Presenting such a corrected and reconstructed text also offers the opportunity of adding numbering, a trivial point, but of considerable practical use when referring to these versions.

A few conventions have been used in the presentation of the diplomatic texts.

( ) Indicate that a reading is probable but uncertain: this has reference to the condition of the manuscript and the clarity of the *akṣaras*, not to the wording of the text.

9 In another article we again find the statement that '[o]ld manuscripts of these sūtras are rare and those available generally follow the *Vaiśeṣikasūtropaskāra* of Śaṅkaramiśra (15th cent. A.D.)' (Thakur 1963b, 78). But here too no details are given after this general statement.

10 I do not intend to give here a detailed account of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts containing the Śaṃkara Miśra recension, nor do I refer extensively to such manuscripts. Though the sūtrapāṭha followed by Śaṃkara Miśra too has not yet been definitively established, I regard the available editions as being for the most part reliable. On one or two occasions alone, I cite the evidence of a Devanāgarī manuscript in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum, number 5346, and a Devanāgarī manuscript in the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, London, shelfmark α 301.

( ) Enclose syllables which were written by the scribe but later cancelled, whether by himself or by another hand.

÷ ÷ Enclose syllables which have been added either in the margin or between the lines. Note that cases where a correction was made in the course of copying by adding syllables in the main text itself, with an indication of where the added text was to be inserted, are treated differently; see the following item.

× × Reproduce similar signs used by the scribe of the Ahmedabad manuscript to enclose syllables which he had first omitted and later added in the body of the text (i.e. not in the margins or between the lines).

Where a consonant was written with a *virāma* or a special *halanta* form,[11] a horizontal bar has been placed under the corresponding letter in the transcription. It was felt that such a convention was useful because the use of these forms, which of course often is accompanied by the non-application of sandhi, may in some cases be intended to serve as a kind of punctuation.

Word division has been added, but it should be remembered that the manuscripts have none, and that, especially where the text is corrupt, the decision where to divide may be difficult and partly arbitrary. No punctuation has been added, but the text has been formatted in paragraphs, one for each *āhnika* (or *adhyāya* where there is no subdivision into *āhnika*s). Finally, the transcriptions add between square brackets folio and line indications.

The reconstructions offered are on some points highly tentative, and should be treated as such. Broadly speaking, the aim was to identify and remove scribal errors with the help of other recensions of the VS and consideration of scribal usage and internal criteria, while preserving all such divergencies and idiosyncracies of which it seemed plausible that—even if they too may in some cases have arisen due to scribal error—they were once taken to be authoritative and commented on. The distinction can perhaps most easily be made clear by asking the reader to assume—as I in fact do—that both these *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, though themselves most probably copies of other manuscripts which contained no commentary,[12] ultimately go back to a version of the VS which was accompanied by a commentary, be it a written one or one which was only given orally. Such a text is likely to have suffered from corruption in transmission, as well as from deliberate change, but it must have been interpretable to the (hypothetical) commentator. It is this version which the reconstruction ideally aims at recovering, though it is a foregone conclusion that at many places this is virtually impossible;

11 The latter occur especially in the Trivandrum manuscript; see section 3.3.2 below.
12 For arguments on this point see p. 230ff. and p. 283ff. below.

for one thing, without the commentary it is impossible to tell to what lengths its author would have gone in explaining away difficulties which had resulted from errors of transmission.

Annotation has been added on some points where my decision in the reconstructions seemed to require comment. This has been felt to be the case particularly when a reading has been accepted which diverges from other versions. Minor corrections of simple errors, on the other hand, have generally been made without comment. Much of the discussion of readings and relationships with other versions of the text of the VS has been reserved for the sections analysing the variants and evaluating the recensions (3.2.5–6 and 3.3.5–6) and for the conclusion (3.4). Orthography has been standardized. On the sūtra and word level, added material has been placed in square brackets to alert the reader; on the *akṣara* level this has not been done. The diplomatic transcriptions should in any case allow the reader to identify all corrections without difficulty.

Compared with Parts I and II of this thesis, this part offers far less in the way of explanatory matter. This is due primarily to the very different nature of the material treated; alone, without the commentaries which presumably once accompanied these versions of the VS, it is in many, or perhaps even most, cases impossible to be sure of how the sūtras are to be interpreted. Consider, for example, that even when the commentaries that we do have are unanimous in their reading, the explanations given often differ widely. There is no way to be certain of how the exegetical traditions with which the versions presented here were once connected understood such sūtras. It is therefore very uncertain ground indeed that I attempt to tread here, and the preliminary and incomplete nature of the analyses, comparisons and evaluations made below must be emphasized. One limitation which has been imposed is that they only deal with cases in the text up to (Candrānanda's) 9.8; the practical consideration that lies behind this is that it is only up to this point that we have the testimony of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's readings and interpretations to compare with. For the later part we have instead the 'Senā Court' commentary, available from 9.1, i.e. overlapping only briefly with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. The tenth *adhyāya* hereof being still unedited, comparison is a difficult task, especially as my consultation of the unique manuscript of the work has alerted me to the fact that Thakur's transcription of the *sūtrapāṭha* found therein (1965) is not always to be relied on

Finally, it should be taken note of that all references to 'Nozawa' in this part without specification of a publication or page are to Nozawa's 'A Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra' (1985).

3.2 The Ahmedabad MS

3.2.1 Description of the manuscript

The manuscript now preserved in the collection of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, which contains a text of the VS is a 'Sammelhandschrift' which I have been able to consult in prints (made from microfilm) generously placed at my disposal by Prof. A. Wezler. According to the library's card, which is included in the photocopies I have used, the manuscript is numbered 26307, consists of 18 folios but is incomplete, and measures 23.5 × 11 cm. The card describes the contents of the manuscript as *nyāyasūtrāṇi ādi aneka prakaraṇo* (sic).

The prints available to me do not cover the complete manuscript, which I have also not seen myself. I am therefore not able to give a full description here. The portion available to me consists of folios 1 to 7 recto. The first text given, covering f. 1r1–f. 4v12,[1] is that of the *Nyāyasūtra*, without a commentary. This is followed by the text of the VS, without a commentary, on f. 4v12–f. 7r8. The work that follows this, beginning on f. 7r8, is the famous Jaina treatise on logic, the *Nyāyāvatāra* of Siddhasena Divākara.[2] The text is bordered on the left and right by three vertical lines, of which the outermost is approximately[3] 1.9 cm and the innermost approximately 2.2 cm from the edge of the paper. There are no similar horizontal lines above and below the body of the text, and the margins left at top and bottom vary between approximately 0.7 cm and 1.2 cm. There are 19 lines on each side. Each side has a roughly square area left blank in the center,[4] measuring approximately 1.6 × 1.6 cm, created by the scribe's leaving a gap in the middle of lines 9–11. Lines 1–8 and 12–19 of each side usually have between 55 and 61 *akṣaras*; lines 9–11 usually have between 51 and 57.

That the codex originated in a Jaina community is confirmed by the use of typically Jaina *maṅgala* symbols such as the *bhale*[5] and by the *namaḥ sarvvavide* at its beginning. The available portion contains no date, and it is unlikely that any is

1 It is somewhat exceptional that f. 1r is already used fully for the copying of the text; in most Northern manuscripts this is left blank or only has the title of the work(s) contained in the codex, or other similar information, written on it.

2 This is preceded by two *maṅgala* verses in which the deity venerated is the goddess of speech (*. . . jayaṃti bhāratīpādanakhacaṃdramarīcayaḥ* f. 7r8, *. . . tribhuvanajananī pātu devī girāṃ vaḥ* f. 7r9). These verses are not found in the *Nyāyāvatāra* edition I have consulted (Upadhye 1971).

3 This approximation, and all subsequent ones, is based on a calculation which took into consideration the size of the manuscript as reported on the library's card and its size in the prints from microfilm which I used. The margin of error is unknown, since it is not certain how accurate the library's measurements are.

4 Cf. e.g. Tripathi 1975, 25–26.

5 Cf. e.g. Tripathi 1975, 39.

preserved; if there had been it ought to have been reported on the library's card, and the remark that the manuscript is incomplete can probably be safely taken as implying that the end, and therefore the final colophon, is wanting. I am loath to assign a date to the manuscript on palaeographic grounds alone; our knowledge of Indian palaeography (and codicology) is still far too rudimentary for that. I would hazard however that it is an old manuscript, that is to say that it is unlikely to be later than the early eighteenth century. It could equally well be one or two centuries earlier than that.

3.2.2 The script and the scribe

The script is Jaina Devanāgarī, with the medial *e* and *o* consistently written *pṛṣṭha-mātra*. As mentioned above, the *bhale* symbol is used, at the beginning of the manuscript. The only palaeographical point which seems worth noting is that the scribe writes *ḍa* in two ways; both the typically Jaina form and the regular Devanāgarī one being found.[6] The hand is neat and regular. As punctuation the scribe uses both single and double *daṇḍas*.[7] Colophons are preceded and followed by the usual *cha*;[8] in the final colophon of the second *adhyāya* of the VS, however, the symbol is written as a *ṣa* instead. The folios are numbered with numerals in the right bottom margin of the verso sides.

3.2.2.1 Scribal errors and corrections

Again it is possible to identify many readings as scribal errors, and most of them can be grouped into familiar categories (cf. p. 44f. above).

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). Several cases, the most significant of which occurs at f. 6r9, noticed and corrected by the scribe himself in the following line; see footnotes 19 and 20 below.[9]

2. Haplography. There are a few cases which may be classed thus, the most important of which is *aṇu* at f. 6r19, where sense, confirmed by the other recen-

6 The former at e.g. f. 6v1 (*parimaṃḍalaṃ*) and the latter at e.g. f. 1r1 (*vitaṃḍā*) in NS [illegible]. For the difference see Renou and Filliozat 1953, 694. In general, the script of our manuscript is very close indeed to the table of 'Nāgarī Jaina' in Renou and Filliozat 1953, 693–695.

7 The use of this punctuation does not always correspond to the text's natural divisions of sense. See the discussion on p. 230 below.

8 Cf. e.g. Bühler 1896, 85.

9 Here and in the following I do not give exhaustive lists of occurrences of a particular phenomenon.

sions, requires the word twice, once as the last word of 7.1.17 and once as the first of 7.1.18. *panaṃ* for *patanaṃ* at f. 5v19 is probably also to be explained thus, and so is *samavāyaḥ* for *sa samavāyaḥ* at f. 6v9, if I am correct in supposing that the latter error was not already present in the hyparchetype.

3. Dittography. Not very frequent in our manuscript, and apparently only occurring on the *akṣara* level. Example: *ititi* for *iti* at f. 5r7.

4. Metathesis. Metathesis of *akṣaras* occurred at two places: °*vaḥbhā* for °*bhāvaḥ* at f. 5r19, and *atayasya* for *ayatasya* at f. 6r13. On both occasions the mistake was noticed and corrected by the scribe.

5. Misreading of similar *akṣaras*. This category is often of special interest, as it may give clues as to the script or other characteristics of the exemplar copied from. In the case of our manuscript, however, there are not many clear indications. The relatively few errors[10] which probably fall into this category include *ṇāṃ* for *ṇī* at f. 5r7, *ṣṭa* for *ṣva* at f. 5r13, *dyā* for *ḍyā* at f. 6r1 (though phonetic similarity may also be involved here), *ca* for *va* at f. 6r3, *pro* for *mo* at f. 6r15, *tvā* for *thā* at f. 7r2.
   On the whole, this suggests, though not conclusively, that the exemplar was written in Devanāgarī, perhaps Jaina Devanāgarī. Certainly there are none of the mistakes typical of transcriptions from e.g. Śāradā script, and a source written in a Southern script can be effectively ruled out.

6. Substitution of phonetically similar *akṣaras*. *vispoṭanaṃ* for *visphoṭanaṃ* at f. 5v17 probably falls into this category.

There remain not a few mistakes for which no easy explanation can be given. Among the more surprising slips are *paṃcamo* for *prathamo* at f. 5r5 (colophon of 1.1), and *dakṣya* for *dagdhasya* at f. 5v17.

On three occasions in the course of copying the text of the VS the scribe discovered that he had omitted matter and supplied the deficiency in the body of the text itself, appropriately marked, rather than in the margin or squeezed between the lines. It is thus possible to see how long it took him to notice his mistake; in each case this apparently happened when he had arrived at the point in the following line directly below the place where he had omitted text.[11] In other places, omission has been corrected by squeezing an *akṣara* between the lines; less frequently by

10 The very fact that misreadings seem to be quite rare may suggest that the script of the exemplar was one with which the scribe was well familiar.

11 Another interpretation of the evidence is possible, though I do not prefer it: it is conceivable that the scribe noted the error sooner and deliberately decided to supply the missing matter at a place directly beneath. But if he had seen the mistake after writing only a few more *akṣaras*

adding the matter to be inserted in the margins. *akṣaras* to be cancelled are marked by small dots placed above them, the number of dots being dependent on the size of the *akṣara*, varying between 2 and 5. In one case, medial *o*, which is formed by a vertical stroke before and one after the consonant sign, has been cancelled by a caret attached to the bottom of each of the two verticals (cf. footnote 18 on p. 211 below). Metathesis has been corrected in both cases where it occurred (see point 5 on p. 207 above) by adding small numbers above the *akṣaras* in question, indicating the order in which they should be read.

As far as I can tell, all corrections were probably made by the original scribe, nor are there any marginalia or other matter in a second hand. On the whole the scribe makes the impression of being careful and conscientious.

3.2.2.2 Ambiguities of the script

Even a diplomatic transcription unavoidably is to some degree an interpretation, and it is practically impossible to indicate at all places whether a particular character could conceivably also be read differently. I should warn those who consult the diplomatic transcription especially of the following points. The scribe's *ta* and *na*, both as separate *akṣaras* and in ligatures, differ but slightly and are sometimes virtually impossible to distinguish. The difference between the stroke of a *daṇḍa* and that of a *pṛṣṭhamātra e* (or *o*) is sometimes a matter of interpretation and context. I also find some of the ligatures with *g* almost indistinguishable, notably *gg*, *gr* and *gn* (and similarly *rgg* and so on).

The scribe does use different forms for *b* and *v*, but occasionally has the latter where the former is required. As in other Jaina Devanāgarī manuscripts, the scribe writes what looks like *dhe* for *dhi* so frequently that one is tempted to regard this as simply an alternate form. I have however transcribed as *dhe* even where I suspect *dhi* may have been intended.[12]

one would rather expect him to have cancelled those and continued correctly. It is just possible perhaps that when the scribe finished a line he checked what he had just written, and decided to be economical and not cancel out half a line or so due to his mistake. But this seems to me a rather unlikely degree of care and deliberation, and if it were the case one would perhaps have a right to expect that even fewer mistakes would have gone unnoticed. I prefer to think that now and then the scribe's eye wandered to the place in the line just above, and reading an *akṣara* or two discovered that he had made an omission.

12 There are a few places where we find the *akṣara* with clearly recognizable medial *i* instead of medial *e*.

3.2.3 Diplomatic transcription

[f. 4v12] athāto dharmmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ| yato bhyu[13]dayani[13]śreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmmaḥ| tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyaṃ pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaṃ kālo dig ātmā mana iti dravyāṇi rūparasagaṃdhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ parimā[14]ṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve vuddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś ca guṇāḥ utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuṃcanaṃ prasāraṇaṃ gamanam iti karmāṇi [15] sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ| kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ| dravyāṇi dravyāṃtaram ārabhaṃte guṇāś ca guṇāntaraṃ| karma karmasādhyaṃ na vidyate [16] kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhe ca| ubhayathā guṇaḥ| kāryavirodhi karmma kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇaṃ dravyam iti dravyalakṣaṇaṃ| dravyāśrayy aguṇavān saṃyo[17]gavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇaṃ ekadravyam aguṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇam iti karmmalakṣaṇaṃ dravyaguṇakarmmaṇāṃ dravyakāraṇaṃ sāmānyaṃ [18] tathā guṇaḥ saṃyogavibhāgānāṃ karmma na dravyāṇāṃ vyatirekāt guṇavaidharmyān na karmmaṇāṃ dravyāṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyaṃ| dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyoga[19]vibhāgāś ca asamavāyāt sāmānyakārya karmma na vidyate| saṃyogānāṃ dravyaṃ rūpāṇāṃ rūpaṃ| gurutvaprayatnasaṃyogānām utkṣepaṇaṃ| saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmmaṇāṃ| kā[f. 5r]raṇasāmānye dravyakarmmaṇāṃ karma kāraṇam uktam iti|| cha prathamasyādyam āhnikaṃ|| cha||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvo na tu kāryābhāvāt karaṇābhāvaḥ sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa [2] iti buddhyapekṣaṃ bhāvo dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmmatvaṃ ca| sāmānyāni viśeṣāś ca anyatrāṃtebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ sad iti yato dravyaguṇakarmmasu sā sattā dravyaguṇakarmmabhyo [3] 'rthāṃtaraṃ sattā| ekadravyatvān na dravyaṃ guṇakarmmasu ca bhāvān na karmma na guṇaḥ| sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvāc ca ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktaṃ| sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca guṇe bhā[4]vād guṇatvam uktaṃ| sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvena ca karmmaṇi bhāvāt karmmatvam uktaṃ| sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvena ca karmmaṇi bhāvāt karmmatvam uktaṃ| sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca sa[5]lliṃgāviśeṣāt viśeṣaliṃgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ|| cha|| paṃcamo dhyāyaḥ| cha|

rūparasagaṃdhasparśavatī pṛthivī| rūparasasparśavatya āpo dravāḥ snigdhāś ca| tejo rūpa[6]rasasparśavat vāyu sparśavān| ta ākāśe na vidyaṃte| sarppirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānāṃ pārthivānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyaṃ| trapusīsaloharajatāsuvarṇṇā[7]nāṃ taijasānām agnisaṃyogād bhavatādbhiḥ sāmānyaṃ| viṣāṇāṃ kakudmān prāṃtevāladhi sāsnāvān iti ti gotve dṛṣṭaṃ liṃgaṃ sparśaś ca na ca dṛṣṭānāṃ sparśa ity adṛṣṭaliṃgo [8] vāyuḥ| adravyatvā dravyaṃ kriyāvatvāt guṇavattvāc ceti| adravyatvena nityatvam uktaṃ|| vāyor vvāyusaṃmūrchanaṃ

13 There is a dot above the line after the *ni*.

nānātve liṃgaṃ vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ [9] liṃgaṃ na
vidyate| sāmānyatodṛṣṭā(c c)[14]āviśeṣaḥ| tasmād āgamikaṃ saṃjñākarma tv
asmadviśiṣṭānāṃ liṃgaṃ| pratyakṣapūrvatvāt saṃjñākarmmaṇaḥ niḥkramaṇaṃ
praveśa[10]nam ity ākāśasya liṃgatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvvaḥ kārye guṇo dṛṣṭaḥ
kāryāṃtarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ| paratra pratyakṣatvāc
ca nātmaguṇo na [11] manoguṇo liṃgam ākāśasya dravyatvanityatve vāyunā
vyākhyāte tatvaṃ bhāvena|| dvitīyasyādyam āhnikaṃ|| cha||

puṣpavastrayoḥ sati saṃnikarṣe gaṃdhāṃtarā|| [12] prādurbhāvo vastre gaṃdhā-
bhāvaliṃgaṃ| etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gaṃdhaḥ tejasy
uṣṇatā| apsu śītatā| aparasmin paraṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram i[13]ti
kālaliṃgāni dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte| tatvaṃ bhāvena kāryaviśeṣeṇa
nānātvaṃ nityeṣṭabhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt| kāraṇe kālākhyā|| ita i[14]dam
iti yatas tad diśāṃ liṃgaṃ dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte| tatvaṃ bhā-
vena kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvaṃ| ādityasaṃyogāt bhūtapūrvād bhaviṣyato bhūtāc
ca prācī| ta[15]thā dakṣiṇā pratīcī| udīcī ca| etena digaṃtarāṇi vyākhyātāni|
sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād viśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśayaḥ| dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭaṃ
dṛṣṭaṃ ca dṛṣṭavat| dṛṣṭaṃ [16] yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭam ubhayathādṛṣṭa-
tvāt| vidyāvidyātaś ca saṃśayaḥ[15] | śrotragrahaṇo yo rthaḥ sa śabdaḥ tasmin
dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmmeti saṃśayaḥ| tulyajātīyeṣv arthāṃ[17]tabhūteṣu ca
viśeṣasyobhayathādṛṣṭatvāt| ekadravyatvān na dravyaṃ| acākṣuṣatvān na kar-
mma guṇasya sato 'pavarggaḥ karmmabhiḥ sādharmyaṃ sato liṃgābhāvāt|
nityavaidha[18]rmyāt kāryatvāt śabdavyaṃjaka abhāvāt kāraṇato vikārāt do-
ṣāt saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ liṃgāc cānityaḥ dvayos tu
pravṛttyor abhāvāt| pra[19]māśabdāt| saṃpratipattibhāvāc ca saṃdigdhāḥ sati
bahutve saṃkhyāvaḥbhā[16] sāmānyataḥ prathamāśabdaḥ saṃpratipattibhāvaś
ceti|| ṣa|| dvitīyo dhyāyaḥ|| ṣa||

+pra+siddhā iṃdriyārthāḥ [f. 5v] iṃdriyārthaprasiddhir iṃdriyārthebhyo 'rthāṃ-
tare hetuḥ so napadeśaḥ kāraṇānām ajñānāt kāryājñānād ajñānāc ca anya eva hetur
ity a'napadeśaḥ [*sic*] | arthāṃtaraṃ hy arthāṃtarāsyā[2]napadeśaḥ saṃyogi sama-
vāyy ekārthasamavāyi virodhe ca | kāryaṃ kāryāṃtarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāṃtarasya
virodhyaṃ bhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtaṃ[17] bhūtasya bhūtaṃ bhūta-
sya [3] prasiddhipūrvakatvād apadeśasya prasiddho 'padeśaḥ asat saṃdigdhāś cā-
napadeśaḥ | viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti | ātmeṃdriyamanorthasaṃni-
karṣā[4]d yan niṣpadyate tad anyat pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṃ-

14 The ligature is blotched.

15 The scribe first started to write something else, perhaps *śya*, instead of *ya*.

16 2 written over *vaḥ*, 1 over *bhā*, in other words correcting to °*bhāvaḥ*.

17 A *ma* has been added above the line after this, perhaps with the intention of correcting °*bhūtaṃ bhūtasya* to °*bhūtam abhūtasya*.

gaṃ || cha || tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikaṃ || cha ||

ātmeṃdriyārthasaṃnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca mana[5]so liṃgaṃ | dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte | prayatnajñānāyaugapadyāc caikaṃ prāṇāc caikaṃ prāṇāpānanimoṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīṃdriyāṃtaravikārā[6]ḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṃgāni | dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vākhyāte | yajñadatta iti sati saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ na vidyate | sāmānya[7]todṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ | tasmād āgamikaṃ nāham iti śabdavyatirekāt | yadi ca pratyakṣo haṃ devadatto haṃ yajñadatta iti | devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīti co[8]pacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ | aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāṃtarapratyakṣaḥ na tu śarīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñanaviśe[9]ṣaḥ sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmyaṃ | nānāvasthātaḥ śāstrasāmarthyāc ca || cha || iti tṛtīyo dhyāyaḥ || cha ||

sad akāraṇavan nityaṃ | tasya kāryaṃ bhiṃ[10]gaṃ | kāraṇabhāvād dhi kāryabhāvaḥ | anityam iti ca viśeṣapratiṣedhabhāvaḥ | avidyāc ca | mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ | etena rasagaṃdhasparśe[11]ṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātaṃ | tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ | saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve karmma ca rūpidravyasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi [12] arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt | etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvveṃdriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātaṃ || cha || caturthasyādyam āhnikaṃ || cha ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇāṃm apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya paṃcā[13]tmakaṃ na vidyate | guṇāṃtarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyātmakam api na ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ paṃcānāṃ tad ayonijaṃ | anekadeśapūrvvakatvāt dharmmaviśeṣāt [14] kāryaviśeṣāt samākhyābhāvāt | saṃjñādimatvāt vedaliṃgāc ca || cha || iti caturtho dhyāyaḥ || cha ||

ātmaprayatnasaṃyogābhyāṃ[18] haste karmma tathā muśalakarmma hasta[15]saṃyogāc cabhighātaje muśalakarmmaṇi vyatirekād akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ | tathātmasaṃyoge hastakarmmaṇi muśalābhighātāt tu muśalasaṃyogād dhaste karmma [16] tathātmakarmma hastasaṃyogāc ca | saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanaṃ | nodanaviśeṣābhāvān norddhaṃ na tiryag gamanaṃ | prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ | nodanaviśeṣād u[17]dasanaviśeṣaḥ | hastakarmmaṇā dārakakarmma vyākhyātaṃ tathā dakṣya vispoṭanaṃ prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanaṃ | tṛṇakarmma vāyusaṃyogān maṇigamanaṃ sū[18]cyabhisarppaṇaṃ ity adṛṣṭakāritāni | iṣāv ayugapat saṃyogaviśeṣāḥ karmmanyatve hetuḥ | nodanād ādyaṃ iṣoḥ karmma | tatkāritāc cottaraṃ tathottaram uttaraṃ ca | saṃ[19]skārābhāve gurutvāt panaṃ || cha || paṃcamasyādyam āhnikaṃ || cha ||

18 The scribe first wrote °*prayoga*°, then corrected this to °*praya*° by cancelling the *o* and the *ga*, and continued with *tna*.

nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāt pṛthivyāṃ karmma | tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritaṃ | apāṃ saṃyogābhāve [f. 6r] gurutvāt patanaṃ | dravatvāt syaṃdanaṃ | nadyā vāyusaṃyogād ārohaṇaṃ nodanāt pīḍanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca | vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritaṃ apāṃ saṃghāto vilaya[2]naṃ ca tejasaḥ saṃyogāt tatra vasphūrjathu liṃgaṃ vaidikaṃ ca apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca pṛthivīkarmmaṇā tejasaḥ karmma kāyukarmma ca vyākhyātaṃ | agner ūrddhajvalanaṃ | vā[3]yos tiryak pacanaṃ aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmmeti adṛṣṭakāritāni hastakarmmaṇā manasaḥ karmma vyākhyātaṃ | ātmendriyamano'rthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe | tadanā[4]raṃbhe ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyoga kāyakarmmaṇātmakarmma vyākhyātaṃ | apasarpaṇam asitapītasaṃyogāḥ kāryāntarasaṃyogāś cetya[5]ḥ || dṛṣṭakāritāni | tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo aprādurbhāvāś ca sa mokṣaḥ | dravyaguṇakarmmaniṣpattiḥ vaidharmmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamas tejaso dravyāṃtareṇāvaraṇāc ca [6] tamaḥ | dikkālāv ākāśaṃ ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmmyān niḥkriyāṇi | etena karmmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ | ni+ḥ+kriyāṇāṃ samavāyaḥ karmmabhyaḥ pratiṣiddhaḥ | kāraṇa[7]tve samavāyino guṇāḥ guṇai dig vyākhyātā | kāraṇena kāla iti || cha || iti paṃcamo dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedo na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṃgam ṛṣeḥ | ta[8]thā vrāhmaṇe saṃjñākarmma siddhiliṃgaṃ buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ | tathā pratigrahaḥ | tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṃgabhūtānāṃ ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇa[9]tvāt | adṛṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāharato[19] doṣaḥ | tad aduṣṭe na vidyate viśiṣṭe pravṛtti same hīno cāpravṛttiḥ | etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmmikebhyaḥ [10] parādāvaṃ vyākhyātaṃ tathā viruddhānāṃ tyagaḥ || ×[20] dayaḥ | tat duṣṭabhojane na vidyate | duṣṭaṃ hiṃsāyāṃ tatsamabhivyāharato ×[21] same ātmatyāgaḥ | paratyāgo vā [11] viśiṣṭa ātmatyāga iti || cha || ṣaṣṭhasyādyam āhnikaṃ || cha ||

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭabhāve prayogo bhyudayāya abhiṣecanopavāsavrahmaca[12]ryagurukulavāsavānaprasthayajñadānaprokṣaṇadignakṣatramaṃtrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || cāturāśramyam upadhāś cānupadhāś ca | bhāvadoṣa upadhā | adoṣo '[13]nupaka iṣṭarasarūpagaṃdhasparśaprokṣitam abhyukṣitaṃ ca tac chuci śucipratiṣedhaḥ arthāṃtaraṃ ca | atayasya[22] śucibhojanād ubhyudayo na vidyate | yamābhāvāt | vidya[14]ve cārthāṃtaratvād yamasya asati cābhāvāt sukhād rāgaḥ | tanmayatvān tṛpteḥ | adṛṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣāḥ icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ tataḥ saṃyo[15]vibhāgaś ca | ātmakarmmasu prokṣo vyākhyātaḥ || cha || iti ṣaṣṭho dhyāyaḥ || cha ||

uktā guṇā guṇalakṣaṇaṃ coktaṃ | idam evaṃguṇam idam evaṃguṇam iti coktaṃ |

19 After this there is an insertion mark (cf. footnote 20).
20 The scribe here realized he had omitted text earlier (cf. footnote 19) and added the missing portion between two crosses.
21 See footnote 20.
22 2 written over *ta* and 1 over *ya*, i.e. corrected to *ayatasya*.

pṛthivyāṃ [16] rūparasagaṃdhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ agnisaṃyogāc ca | guṇāṃtaraprādurbhāvāt etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktaṃ | apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityāḥ dravyanityatvāt nitye[17]ṣv anityāḥ dravyānityatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvvāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajāś ca | apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvvāḥ pākajā na vidyaṃte | aguṇavato dravyasya guṇāraṃbhāt karmmaṇā [18] guṇāḥ etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ | ekadravyatvāt | aṇor mahatoś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte | kākāra+ṇa+bahutvāt kāraṇamahatvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat | vi[19]parītam aṇu mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca | ekakālatvāt dṛṣṭāṃtāc ca aṇutvamahatvayor aṇutvamahatvābhāvaḥ | karmmaṇair vyākhyātaḥ | aṇutvamahattvā[f. 6v]bhyāṃ karmmaguṇā aguṇāḥ | etena dīrghatvahrasatve vyākhyāte | karmmabhi karmmāṇi | guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ tad anitye nityaṃ parimaṃḍalaṃ | avidyā vidyāliṃgaṃ vibhāvān mahān ākā[2]śas tathā cātmā tadabhāvād aṇu manaḥ | guṇair dig vyākhyātāḥ | kāraṇena kāla iti || cha || saptamasyādyam āhnikaṃ || cha ||

rūparasasparśavyatirekād arthāṃtaram ekatvaṃ | tathā [3] pṛthaktvaṃ | tayor nityatvānityatve | tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte | niṣpattiś ca | ekatvapṛthaktvayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ | karma[4]bhiḥ karmmāṇi | guṇair guṇāḥ niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmmaguṇānāṃ sarvvaikatvaṃ na vidyate | ekasyābhāvād bhāktaṃ na vidyate | kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na [5] vidyate | etad anityayor vyākhyātaṃ | anyatarakarmmaja ubhayakarmmaja saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ | etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ | saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhā[6]vo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ | karmmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇair guṇāḥ | yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgo na vidyate | guṇatvā guṇe ca bhāṣyate niḥ[7]kriyatvāt | ati nāstīti prayogāc chabdārthāv asaṃbaddhau | saṃyogino daṃḍāt samavāyino viṣāṇāc ca dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ | tathā pratyayābhāvaḥ saṃbaṃdhisaṃbaṃdhād i[8]ti cet saṃdehaḥ | sāmayikaḥ śabdārthe pratyayaḥ ekaddikkālābhyāṃ saṃnikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param aparaṃ kāraṇatvāt kāraṇatvāc ca paratvāparatve paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvā[9]paratvayo 'bhāvo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ | karmmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇai guṇāḥ iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ samavāyaḥ dravyatvaguṇatvakarmmatvapratiṣedho [10] bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ | tatvaṃ bhāvena | cha || iti saptamo dhyāyaḥ || cha ||

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātaṃ | mana ātmā cca | jñānanirddeśe jñānaniḥpattir uktā guṇakarmma[11]ṣv asaṃnivṛtteṣu | jñānaniṣpatte dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣāpekṣaṃ dravya[12]guṇakarmmasu dravye dravyaguṇakarmmāpekṣaṃ | guṇakarmmasu guṇakarmmābhāvād guṇakarmmāpekṣaṃ na vidyate | samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ te kāryakāraṇa(karmmābhāvā)[13]bhūte iti | dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ | kāraṇāyaugapadyāt guṇakarmmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt

ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣaṃ dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣv abhāvāt | artha iti dravyaguṇakarmmasu || cha || aṣṭamasyādyāhnikaṃ || cha ||

dravyeṣu paṃcātmakaṃ pratyuktaṃ | bhūyastvāt gaṃdhavatvāc ca pṛthivī gaṃdhajñāne | tathāpas tejo vāyu[15]ś ca | rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣād iti | aṣṭamo dhyāyaḥ || cha ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asat | sad asat | asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāṃ[16]taraṃ | sac cāsat | yac cānyat sat bhū[23] sat | asad iti bhūtapratyakṣābhāvād bhūtasmṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca jñānaṃ | tathā[24]bhāve bhāvapratyakṣatvāc ca | etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmma[17]ś ca vyākhyātaḥ | abhūtaṃ nāstī×da×[25]ty anarthāṃtaraṃ | nāsti ghaṭo geha saṃyogapratiṣedhaḥ nāsty anyaś caṃdramā iti sāmānyāc caṃdramasi pratiṣedhaḥ | sad asato vaidharmmyāt [18] kārye sadasattā na ātmany[26] ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣaṃ tathā dravyāṃtareṣu ātmeṃdriyamano'rthasaṃnikarṣāc ca | tatsamavāyāt karmmaguṇeṣu ā[19]tmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ saṃbaṃdhekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṃgikaṃ | etena śabdaṃ vyākhyātaṃ | hetur apadeśo liṃgaṃ nimittaṃ pramāṇaṃ kāra[f. 7r]ṇam ity anarthāntaraṃ asyodam iti buddhyapekṣatvāt | ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ tatvā svapnaḥ svapnāṃtikaṃ dharmmāc ca iṃdriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā [2] tad duṣṭaṃ jñānaṃ | aduṣṭaṃ vidyā | ārṣasiddhadarśanaṃ ca dharmmebhyaḥ || cha || iti navamo 'dhyāyaḥ |

ātmasamavāyaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthāṃtaratve hetuḥ tadāśrayebhyaś ca guṇebhyaḥ iṣṭāni[3]ṣṭakāraṇavirodhād viśeṣāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthāntarabhāvaḥ saṃśayanirṇayāṃtarabhāvaś ca jñānāṃtaratve hetuḥ | tayor niṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṃgikābhyāṃ vākhyātā | bhūtam i[4]ti pratyakṣaṃ vyākhyātaṃ | bhaviṣyatīti kāryāṃtare dṛṣṭatvāt tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo napekṣebhyaś ca abhūd ity abhūtāt | sati ca[27] kāryāsamavāyāt ekārthasamavāyiṣu [5] karaṇāṃtareṣu (ta) darśanāt meka[28] iti | śiraḥ pṛṣṭam udaraṃ pāṃṇir iti | tadviśeṣebhyaḥ kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāt ⟨syā⟩ saṃyogād (v)ā kāraṇasamavāyāt karmmāṇi [6] tathā rūpe kāraṇakāraṇasama×deśa×[29]vāyāc ca | kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge | kāraṇakāraṇasamavāyāc ca | saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikaṃ laiṃgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyā[7]taṃ | daśamasyādyāhnikaṃ || cha ||

23 There is an insertion mark after this (cf. footnote 25 below).
24 *thā* possibly corrected from *thāṃ*.
25 The scribe here realized and corrected his earlier omission by adding *da* between crosses (cf. footnote 23).
26 ātmany: MS^{pc}, ātmāny MS^{ac}
27 sati ca: MS^{pc}, saciti MS^{ac}; corrected by cancelling the *i* on *ci* and adding 1 over *ti* and 2 over *ca*.
28 There is an insertion mark after this (cf. footnote 29 below).
29 The scribe realized his earlier omission here and added *deśa* between two crosses (cf. footnote 28).

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || cha || iti daśamo dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ || cha || samāptāni [8] vaiśeṣikasūtrāṇi || cha || śrīḥ ||

athāto dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ || 1.1.1 ||
yato 'bhyudayaniḥśreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmaḥ || 1.1.2 ||
tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 1.1.3 ||
pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaṃ kālo dig ātmā mana iti dravyāṇi || 1.1.4 ||
rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś ca guṇāḥ || 1.1.5 ||
utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuñcanaṃ prasāraṇaṃ gamanam iti karmāṇi || 1.1.6 ||
sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ || 1.1.7 ||
dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante || 1.1.8 ||
guṇāś ca guṇāntaram || 1.1.9 ||
karma karmasādhyaṃ na vidyate || 1.1.10 ||
kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca || 1.1.11 ||
ubhayathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.12 ||
kāryavirodhi karma || 1.1.13 ||
kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇaṃ dravyam iti dravyalakṣaṇam || 1.1.14 ||
dravyāśrayy aguṇavān saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇam || 1.1.15 ||
ekadravyam aguṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇam iti karmalakṣaṇam || 1.1.16 ||
dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyam || 1.1.17 ||
tathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.18 ||
saṃyogavibhāgānāṃ karma || 1.1.19 ||
na dravyāṇāṃ vyatirekāt || 1.1.20 ||
guṇavaidharmyān na karmaṇām || 1.1.21 ||
dravyāṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam || 1.1.22 ||
dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgāś ca || 1.1.23 ||
asamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ kāryaṃ karma na vidyate || 1.1.24 ||
saṃyogānāṃ dravyam || 1.1.25 ||
rūpāṇāṃ rūpam || 1.1.26 ||
gurutvaprayatnasaṃyogānām utkṣepaṇam || 1.1.27 ||
saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmaṇām || 1.1.28 ||

iti prathamasyādyam āhnikam ||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvaḥ || 1.2.1 ||
na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ || 1.2.2 ||
sāmānyam viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam || 1.2.3 ||
bhāvaḥ || 1.2.4 ||
dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmatvaṃ ca sāmānyāni viśeṣāś ca || 1.2.5 ||
anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ || 1.2.6 ||
sad iti yato dravyaguṇakarmasu sā sattā || 1.2.7 ||
dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaraṃ sattā || 1.2.8 ||
ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 1.2.9 ||
guṇakarmasu ca bhāvān na karma na guṇaḥ || 1.2.10 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāc ca || 1.2.11 ||
ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam || 1.2.12 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.13 ||
guṇe bhāvād guṇatvam uktam || 1.2.14 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.15 ||
karmaṇi bhāvāt karmatvam uktam || 1.2.16 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.17 ||
salliṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ || 1.2.18 ||

[iti] prathamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivī || 2.1.1 ||
rūparasasparśavatya āpo dravāḥ snigdhāś ca || 2.1.2 ||
tejo rūpasparśavat[32] || 2.1.3 ||

30 It seems far more likely that the manuscript's *karma kāraṇam* is an instance of the fairly common error of omission of the stroke for medial *ā* than that this anomalous reading—an explicit contradiction of the Vaiśeṣika axiom that motions may produce qualities (conjunctions and disjunctions) but do not directly produce substances or other actions—is to be attributed to the hyparchetype.

31 I regard the *iti* after this as belonging (in the hyparchetype at least) to the colophon, though placed before the double *daṇḍas* and *cha*. Note that the scribe is very inconsistent with regard to his *itis* at the end of *āhnikas* and *adhyāyas*, sometimes writing one after and sometimes before the double *daṇḍas* and *cha*, and sometimes omitting one altogether. As was already remarked above (p. 191 above) it is quite common for an *iti* which clearly belongs to a colophon rather than the actual text to 'migrate' backwards and be written before the *daṇḍa*(s) which one expects to separate the two. In the following I consistently regard concluding *itis* as belonging to the colophon and supply them where they are omitted; admittedly this is hairsplitting which may be superfluous, as it is very doubtful whether it is possible or useful to reconstruct the colophons of the hyparchetype, and the consistency thus imposed may be one which never existed.

32 It is far more probable that the manuscript's *rūparasasparśavat* is a result of scribal carelessness

ta ākāśe na vidyante || 2.1.5 ||

sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānāṃ pārthivānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.6 ||

trapusīsaloharajatasuvarṇānāṃ taijasānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.7 ||

viṣāṇī kakudmān prāntevāladhiḥ sāsnāvān iti gotve dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgam || 2.1.8 ||

sparśaś ca || 2.1.9 ||

na ca dṛṣṭānāṃ sparśa ity adṛṣṭaliṅgo vāyuḥ || 2.1.10 ||

adravyatvād dravyam || 2.1.11 ||

kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ceti || 2.1.12 ||

adravyatvena nityatvam uktam || 2.1.13 ||

vāyor vāyusaṃmūrchanaṃ nānātve liṅgam || 2.1.14 ||

vāyur iti [sati] saṃnikarṣe[33] pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgaṃ na vidyate || 2.1.15 ||

sāmānyato dṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 2.1.16 ||

tasmād āgamikam || 2.1.17 ||

saṃjñākarma tv asmadviśiṣṭānāṃ liṅgam || 2.1.18 ||

pratyakṣapūrvakatvāt saṃjñākarmaṇaḥ || 2.1.19 ||

niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgatvāt || 2.1.20 ||

kāraṇaguṇapūrvaḥ kārye guṇo dṛṣṭaḥ || 2.1.21 ||

kāryāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ || 2.1.22 ||

paratra pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ || 2.1.23 ||

liṅgam ākāśasya || 2.1.24 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.1.25 ||

tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.1.26 ||

[iti] dvitīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

puṣpavastrayoḥ sati saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre gandhābhāvaliṅgam || 2.2.1 ||

than that there actually were Vaiśeṣikas who held such a view, though it should be noted that Praśastapāda finds it necessary to explain the (apparent) occurrence of taste in metals which are thought to be fire-substances, writing *tatra saṃyuktasamavāyād rasādyupalabdhiḥ* (PDhS 39.10–11).

33 On balance, it seems probable that the omission of *sati* here is due to error in the transmission after the hyparchetype. Note that in the sūtras 2.2.1 and 3.2.7, which are similarly worded, the manuscript does have *sati*; especially 3.2.7 is very closely parallel, only differing in having *yajñadatta* for *vāyur*. The error may be classified either as due to homoeoteleuton, the eye of the scribe skipping from the *ti* of *iti* to that of *sati*, or as a kind of haplography, *sati* and *saṃni°* being very similar.

vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gandhaḥ || 2.2.3 ||
tejasy uṣṇatā || 2.2.4 ||
apsu śītatā || 2.2.5 ||
aparasmin paraṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram iti kālaliṅgāni || 2.2.6 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.7 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.8 ||
kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.9 ||
nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt || 2.2.10 ||
kāraṇe kālākhyā || 2.2.11 ||
ita idam iti yatas tad diśāṃ liṅgam || 2.2.12 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.13 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.14 ||
kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.15 ||
ādityasaṃyogād bhūtapūrvād bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācī || 2.2.16 ||
tathā dakṣiṇā pratīcy udīcī ca || 2.2.17 ||
etena digantarāṇi vyākhyātāni || 2.2.18 ||
sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād viśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.19 ||
dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭam || 2.2.20 ||
dṛṣṭaṃ ca dṛṣṭavat || 2.2.21 ||
dṛṣṭaṃ yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭam ubhayathādṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.22 ||
vidyāvidyātaś ca saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.23 ||
śrotragrahaṇo yo 'rthaḥ sa śabdaḥ || 2.2.24 ||
tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.25 ||
tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu ca viśeṣasyobhayathādṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.26 ||
ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 2.2.27 ||
acākṣuṣatvān na karma || 2.2.28 ||
guṇasya sato 'pavargaḥ karmabhiḥ sādharmyam || 2.2.29 ||
sato liṅgābhāvāt || 2.2.30 ||
nityavaidharmyāt || 2.2.31 ||
kāryatvāt || 2.2.32 ||
śabdavyañjaka abhāvāt || 2.2.33 ||
kāraṇato vikārāt || 2.2.34 ||
doṣāt || 2.2.35 ||
saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ || 2.2.36 ||
liṅgāc cānityaḥ || 2.2.37 ||
dvayos tu pravṛttyor abhāvāt || 2.2.38 ||

[saṃkhyābhāvāt][34] || 2.2.39 ||
prathamāśabdāt || 2.2.40 ||
sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.41 ||
saṃdigdhāḥ sati bahutve || 2.2.42 ||
saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ || 2.2.43 ||
prathamāśabdaḥ || 2.2.44 ||
sampratipattibhāvaś ca || 2.2.45 ||

iti dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

prasiddhā indriyārthāḥ || 3.1.1 ||
indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntare hetuḥ || 3.1.2 ||
so 'napadeśaḥ || 3.1.3 ||
kāraṇānām ajñānāt || 3.1.4 ||
kāryājñānāt || 3.1.5 ||
ajñānāc ca || 3.1.6 ||
anya eva hetur iti anapadeśaḥ || 3.1.7 ||
arthāntaraṃ hy arthāntarasyānapadeśaḥ || 3.1.8 ||
saṃyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ca kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abhūtasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasya || 3.1.9 ||
prasiddhipūrvakatvād apadeśasya || 3.1.11 ||
prasiddho 'padeśaḥ || 3.1.12 ||
asan saṃdigdhaś cānapadeśaḥ || 3.1.13 ||
viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti || 3.1.14 ||
ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣād yan niṣpadyate tad anyat || 3.1.15 ||
pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam || 3.1.16 ||

[iti] tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca manaso liṅgam || 3.2.1 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.2 ||
prayatnajñānāyaugapadyāc caikam || 3.2.3 ||
prāṇāc caikam[35] || 3.2.4 ||
prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni || 3.2.5 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.6 ||

34 Assuming this sūtra to have been lost as a result of eyeskip (homoeoteleuton). That it was not lacking in the hyparchetype is suggested, to my mind, by the presence of 2.2.43.
35 See p. 232 below.

yajñadatta iti sati saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ [liṅgaṃ][36] na vidyate || 3.2.7 ||
sāmānyato dṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.8 ||
tasmād āgamikam || 3.2.9 ||
nāham iti śabdavyatirekāt || 3.2.10 ||
yadi ca pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti || 3.2.11 ||
devadatto gacchatīti viṣṇumitro gacchatīti copacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ || 3.2.12 ||
saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ || 3.2.13 ||
aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāntarapratyakṣaḥ || 3.2.14 ||
na tu śarīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñānaviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.15 ||
sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmyam || 3.2.16 ||
nānāvasthātaḥ || 3.2.17 ||
śāstrasāmarthyāc ca || 3.2.18 ||

iti tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

sad akāraṇavan nityam || 4.1.1 ||
tasya kāryaṃ liṅgam || 4.1.2 ||
kāraṇabhāvād dhi kāryabhāvaḥ || 4.1.3 ||
anityam iti ca viśeṣapratiṣedhabhāvaḥ || 4.1.4 ||
avidyā ca || 4.1.5 ||
mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ || 4.1.6 ||
etena rasagandhasparśeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.7 ||
tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ || 4.1.8 ||
saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve karma ca rūpidravyasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi || 4.1.9 ||
arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt || 4.1.10 ||
etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.11 ||

[iti] caturthasyādyam āhnikam ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate || 4.2.1 ||
guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyātmakam api na || 4.2.2 ||
ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām || 4.2.3 ||
tad ayonijam || 4.2.4 ||

36 I assume that this word, present in all other versions, has been omitted due to scribal error post-dating the hyparchetype, though there is no clear cause of eyeskip. In the parallel sūtra 2.1.15 the manuscript does have *liṅgaṃ*.

anekadeśapūrvakatvāt || 4.2.5 ||
dharmaviśeṣāt || 4.2.6 ||
kāryaviśeṣāt || 4.2.7 ||
samākhyābhāvāt || 4.2.8 ||
saṃjñādimattvāt || 4.2.9 ||
vedaliṅgāc ca || 4.2.10 ||

iti caturtho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmaprayatnasaṃyogābhyāṃ haste karma || 5.1.1 ||
tathā musalakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.2 ||
abhighātaje musalakarmaṇi vyatirekād akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ || 5.1.3 ||
tathātmasaṃyogo hastakarmaṇi || 5.1.4 ||
musalābhighātāt tu musalasaṃyogād dhaste karma || 5.1.5 ||
tathātmakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.6 ||
saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.7 ||
nodanaviśeṣābhāvān nordhvaṃ na tiryag gamanam || 5.1.8 ||
prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.9 ||
nodanaviśeṣād udasanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.10 ||
hastakarmaṇā dārakakarma vyākhyātam || 5.1.11 ||
tathā dagdhasya visphoṭanam || 5.1.12 ||
prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanam || 5.1.13 ||
tṛṇakarma vāyusaṃyogāt || 5.1.14 ||
maṇigamanaṃ sūcyabhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.1.15 ||
iṣāv ayugapat saṃyogaviśeṣāḥ karmānyatve hetuḥ || 5.1.16 ||
nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma tatkāritāc cottaraṃ tathottaram uttaraṃ ca || 5.1.17 ||
saṃskārābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.18 ||

[iti] pañcamasyādyam āhnikam ||

nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāt pṛthivyāṃ karma || 5.2.1 ||
tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.2 ||
apāṃ saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.2.3 ||
dravatvāt syandanam || 5.2.4 ||
nāḍyā vāyusaṃyogād ārohaṇam || 5.2.5 ||
nodanāt pīḍanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca || 5.2.6 ||
vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.7 ||
apāṃ saṃghāto vilayanaṃ ca tejasaḥ saṃyogāt || 5.2.8 ||
tatrāvasphūrjathur liṅgam || 5.2.9 ||
vaidikaṃ ca || 5.2.10 ||

apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca || 5.2.11 ||
pṛthivīkarmaṇā tejasaḥ karma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam || 5.2.12 ||
agner ūrdhvajvalanaṃ vāyos tiryak pavanam aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.13 ||
hastakarmaṇā manasaḥ karma vyākhyātam || 5.2.14 ||
ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe || 5.2.15 ||
tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyogaḥ || 5.2.16 ||
kāyakarmaṇātmakarma vyākhyātam || 5.2.17 ||
apasarpaṇam [upasarpaṇam][37] aśitapītasaṃyogāḥ kāryāntarasaṃyogāś cety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.18 ||
tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣaḥ || 5.2.19 ||
dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamaḥ || 5.2.20 ||
tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca tamaḥ || 5.2.21 ||
dikkālāv ākāśaṃ ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmyān niḥkriyāṇi || 5.2.22 ||
etena karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ || 5.2.23 ||
niḥkriyāṇāṃ samavāyaḥ karmabhyaḥ pratiṣiddhaḥ || 5.2.24 ||
kāraṇaṃ tv asamavāyino guṇāḥ[38] || 5.2.25 ||
guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 5.2.26 ||
kāraṇena kālaḥ || 5.2.27 ||

iti pañcamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedaḥ || 6.1.1 ||
na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam ṛṣeḥ || 6.1.2 ||
tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam || 6.1.3 ||
buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ || 6.1.4 ||
tathā pratigrahaḥ || 6.1.5 ||
tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām || 6.1.6 ||
ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt || 6.1.7 ||
aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato 'bhyudayaḥ || 6.1.8 ||
tad duṣṭabhojane na vidyate || 6.1.9 ||
duṣṭaṃ hiṃsāyām || 6.1.10 ||
tatsamabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ || 6.1.11 ||
tad aduṣṭe na vidyate || 6.1.12 ||
viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ || 6.1.13 ||
same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ || 6.1.14 ||

37 Obviously omitted as a result of eyeskip.
38 I assume that the *kāraṇatve samavāyino guṇāḥ* of the manuscript is an error for this, seeing no way to interpret that reading sensibly, nor another likely hyparchetype reading.

etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyaḥ parādānaṃ vyākhyātam || 6.1.15 ||
tathā viruddhānāṃ tyāgaḥ || 6.1.16 ||
sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā || 6.1.17 ||
viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ || 6.1.18 ||

iti ṣaṣṭhasyādyam āhnikam ||

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya || 6.2.1 ||
abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthyayajñadāna-prokṣaṇadiṅnakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || 6.2.2 ||
cāturāśramyam || 6.2.3 ||
upadhāś cānupadhāś ca || 6.2.4 ||
bhāvadoṣa upadhā || 6.2.5 ||
adoṣo 'nupadhā || 6.2.6 ||
iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ prokṣitam abhyukṣitaṃ ca tac chuci || 6.2.7 ||
[aśuci] śucipratiṣedhaḥ || 6.2.8 ||
arthāntaraṃ ca || 6.2.9 ||
ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt || 6.2.10 ||
vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya || 6.2.11 ||
asati cābhāvāt || 6.2.12 ||
sukhād rāgaḥ || 6.2.13 ||
tanmayatvāt || 6.2.14 ||
tṛpteḥ || 6.2.15 ||
adṛṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ || 6.2.16 ||
icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ || 6.2.17 ||
tataḥ saṃyogo vibhāgaś ca || 6.2.18 ||
ātmakarmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ || 6.2.19 ||

iti ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

uktā guṇāḥ || 7.1.1 ||
guṇalakṣaṇaṃ coktam || 7.1.2 ||
idam evaṃguṇam idam evaṃguṇam iti coktam || 7.1.3 ||
pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ || 7.1.4 ||
agnisaṃyogāc ca || 7.1.5 ||
guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt || 7.1.6 ||
etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam || 7.1.7 ||
apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyanityatvāt || 7.1.8 ||

anityeṣv[39] anityā dravyānityatvāt || 7.1.9 ||
kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajāś ca || 7.1.10 ||
apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pākajā na vidyante || 7.1.11 ||
aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.12 ||
etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ || 7.1.13 ||
ekadravyatvāt || 7.1.14 ||
aṇor mahatoś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || 7.1.15 ||
kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || 7.1.16 ||
viparītam aṇu || 7.1.17 ||
[aṇu][40] mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca || 7.1.18 ||
ekakālatvāt || 7.1.19 ||
dṛṣṭāntāc ca || 7.1.20 ||
aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvaḥ karmaguṇair vyākhyātaḥ || 7.1.21 ||
aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.22 ||
etena dīrghatvahrasvatve vyākhyāte || 7.1.23 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.24 ||
guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ || 7.1.25 ||
tad anitye || 7.1.26 ||
nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam || 7.1.27 ||
avidyā vidyāliṅgam || 7.1.28 ||
vibhavān mahān ākāśaḥ || 7.1.29 ||
tathā cātmā || 7.1.30 ||
tadabhāvād aṇu manaḥ || 7.1.31 ||
guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 7.1.32 ||
kāraṇena kālaḥ || 7.1.33 ||

iti saptamasyādyam āhnikam ||

rūparasa[gandha]sparśavyatirekād[41] arthāntaram ekatvam || 7.2.1 ||
tathā pṛthaktvam || 7.2.2 ||
tayor nityānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte || 7.2.3 ||
niṣpattiś ca || 7.2.4 ||
ekatvapṛthaktvayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.5 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.6 ||

39 I am unable to believe that the *nityeṣv* of the manuscript can be anything but a scribal error which was not in the hyparchetype.
40 Assuming haplography.
41 I cannot imagine that the omission of *gandha* goes back to the hyparchetype, although there is nothing that can easily have provoked the error.

guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.7 ||
niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmaguṇānāṃ sarvaikatvaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.8 ||
ekasyābhāvād bhāktaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.9 ||
kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete || 7.2.10 ||
etad anityayor vyākhyātam || 7.2.11 ||
anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ || 7.2.12 ||
etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.13 ||
saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.14 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.15 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.16 ||
yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete || 7.2.17 ||
guṇatvāt || 7.2.18 ||
guṇe ca bhāṣyate || 7.2.19 ||
niḥkriyatvāt || 7.2.20 ||
asati nāstīti prayogāt || 7.2.21 ||
śabdārthāv asambaddhau || 7.2.22 ||
saṃyogino daṇḍāt samavāyino viṣāṇāc ca || 7.2.23 ||
dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ || 7.2.24 ||
tathā pratyayābhāvaḥ || 7.2.25 ||
sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ || 7.2.26 ||
sāmayikaḥ śabdārthapratyayaḥ || 7.2.27 ||
ekadikkālābhyāṃ saṃnikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param aparam || 7.2.28 ||
kāraṇa[para]tvāt kāraṇā[para]tvāc[42] ca paratvāparatve || 7.2.29 ||
paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvāparatvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.30 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.31 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.32 ||
iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ [sa][43] samavāyaḥ || 7.2.33 ||
dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratiṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.34 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 7.2.35 ||

iti saptamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

42 There is no obvious reason why °*para*° should have been twice omitted, but the resulting reading is anomalous and uninterpretable.
43 Assuming haplography.

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 8.1.1 ||
mana ātmā ca || 8.1.2 ||
jñānanirdeśe jñānaniṣpattir uktā || 8.1.3 ||
guṇakarmasv asaṃnivṛtteṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca || 8.1.4 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam || 8.1.5 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣāpekṣaṃ dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.1.6 ||
dravye dravyaguṇakarmāpekṣam || 8.1.7 ||
guṇakarmasu guṇakarmābhāvād guṇakarmāpekṣaṃ na vidyate || 8.1.8 ||
samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ [śvete buddhis][44] te kāryakāraṇabhūte iti || 8.1.9 ||
dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ || 8.1.10 ||
kāraṇāyaugapadyāt || 8.1.11 ||
guṇakarmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt || 8.1.12 ||
ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣam || 8.1.13 ||
dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣv abhāvāt || 8.1.14 ||
artha iti dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.1.15 ||

[ity] aṣṭamasyādyam āhnikam ||

dravyeṣu pañcātmakaṃ pratyuktam || 8.2.1 ||
bhūyastvād gandhavattvāc ca pṛthivī gandhajñāne || 8.2.2 ||
tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt || 8.2.3 ||

ity aṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asat || 9.1 ||
sad asat || 9.2 ||
asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram || 9.3 ||
sac cāsat || 9.4 ||
yac cānyat satas tad asat[45] || 9.5 ||
asad iti bhūtapratyakṣābhāvād bhūtasmṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca jñānam || 9.6 ||
tathābhāve bhāvapratyakṣatvāc ca || 9.7 ||
etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ || 9.8 ||
abhūtaṃ nāstīty anarthāntaram || 9.9 ||

44 Assuming an omission caused by eyeskip from °*buddheḥ* to *buddhis*: I am at a loss how to construe the sūtra otherwise.

45 The manuscript is clearly corrupt at this point: the solution proposed, assuming among other things an error of *bhū* for *ta*, is little more than a guess.

nāsti ghaṭo geha [iti sato ghaṭasya geha]saṃyogapratiṣedhaḥ[46] 9.10 ||
nāsty anyaś candramā iti sāmānyāc candramasi pratiṣedhaḥ || 9.11
sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na || 9.12 ||
ātmany ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam || 9.13 ||
tathā dravyāntareṣu || 9.14 ||
ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāc ca || 9.15 ||
tatsamavāyāt karmaguṇeṣu || 9.16 ||
ātmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu || 9.17 ||
asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikam || 9.18 ||
etena śābdaṃ vyākhyātam || 9.19 ||
hetur apadeśo liṅgaṃ nimittaṃ pramāṇaṃ kāraṇam ity anarthāntaram 9.20 ||
asyedam iti buddhyapekṣatvāt || 9.21 ||
ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ || 9.22 ||
tathā svapnaḥ svapnāntikam || 9.23 ||
dharmāc ca || 9.24 ||
indriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā || 9.25 ||
tad duṣṭaṃ jñānam || 9.26 ||
aduṣṭaṃ vidyā || 9.27 ||
ārṣaṃ siddhadarśanaṃ ca dharmebhyaḥ || 9.28 ||

iti navamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmasamavāyaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthāntaratve hetus tadāśrayebhyaś ca guṇebhyaḥ || 10.1.1 ||
iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇavirodhād viśeṣāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthāntarabhāvaḥ 10.1.2 ||
saṃśayanirṇayāntarabhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ || 10.1.3 ||
tayor niṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṅgikābhyāṃ vyākhyātā || 10.1.4 ||
bhūtam iti pratyakṣaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.1.5 ||
bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare dṛṣṭatvāt || 10.1.6 ||
tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo 'napekṣebhyaś ca || 10.1.7 ||
abhūd ity abhūtāt || 10.1.8 ||
sati ca kāryāsamavāyāt || 10.1.9 ||
ekārthasamavāyiṣu kāraṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa iti || 10.1.10 ||
śiraḥ pṛṣṭham udaraṃ pāṇir iti tadviśeṣebhyaḥ || 10.1.11 ||
kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāt || 10.1.12 ||

46 Assuming omission due to eyeskip.

saṃyogād vā || 10.1.13 ||
kāraṇasamavāyāt karmāṇi || 10.1.14 ||
tathā rūpe kāraṇakāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.1.15 ||
kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge || 10.1.16 ||
kāraṇakāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.1.17 ||
saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikam || 10.1.18 ||
laiṅgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.1.19 ||

[iti] daśamasyādyam āhnikam ||

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya || 10.2.1 ||
tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 10.2.2 ||

iti daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||

samāptāni vaiśeṣikasūtrāṇi ||

3.2.5 Analysis of variants

Difficult though it is to come to conclusions about the text-quality of the hyparchetype and its relation to other versions of the VS, some remarks and suggestions on these points must be made. Though considerably more detailed than the preliminary observations made in Isaacson 1995, section II, these are still very tentative. To go much deeper, however, would involve considering a large number of individual sūtras in great detail, taking into consideration all possible evidence, including testimonia, and must remain a matter for later studies.

To begin with, we may look at what evidence can be found about the nature of the latest ancestor of the manuscript; the question I wish to address is whether this consisted of a text of the sūtras alone or contained them within a commentary.[47]

It must be noted that there is no attempt to provide numbering of the sūtras. It seems certain that the scribe uses punctuation to mark the ends of sūtras, but it is also quite clear that he is by no means thorough in this respect, even if we allow that the non-application of sandhi may also sometimes serve the same purpose. In many cases there is nothing except the sense (and the parallel recensions) to tell us that we have two sūtras rather than one.[48] More significantly, there are a few places where it seems certain that the scribe failed to identify the end of sūtras correctly, placing a *daṇḍa* within what must be taken as a single sūtra.[49] This renders it unlikely that the *sūtrapāṭha* was extracted by the scribe from a manuscript with the sūtras embedded in a commentary (or indeed from a manuscript of a commentary in which the sūtras were omitted or given only in *pratīka*s), for a scribe capable of doing that might well have made mistakes, it is true, but they would probably not be of this particular kind.

A second, even stronger, argument that points to the same conclusion can be made on the basis of some of the cases of omission of text due to eyeskip or haplography. When the eyeskip is between words in different sūtras,[50] this phenomenon seems to me wholly inconsistent with the assumption of a learned scribe extracting the sūtras from their surrounding commentary; it can only be plausibly explained if

47 Preliminary remarks on this topic are to be found in Isaacson 1995, 753–754.

48 E.g. *etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gaṃdhaḥ* f. 5r12 (2.2.2–3).

49 See *gaṃdhāntarā* || *prādurbhāvo* (for *gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo*) at f. 5r11–12 (2.2.1), *cetyā-dṛṣṭakāritāni* for *cety adṛṣṭakāritāni* at f. 6r4–5 (5.2.13), *guṇakarmmasv asaṃnivṛtteṣu jñāna-nispatte dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca* at f. 6v10–11 (8.1.4). The fact that all these instances involve the end of a line and the beginning of the next is in my view probably significant, but does not invalidate the point made.

50 This is the case at f. 6r9–10 (eyeskip between °*vyāhārato* [°*vyāharato* MS] in 6.1.8 and in 6.1.11: cf. footnotes 19 and 20 above) and at f. 6r13 (eyeskip—virtually haplography—between *chuci* in 6.2.7 and *aśuci* in 6.2.8; cf. p. 255 below). Note also the haplography of *anu* at f. 6r14 (7.1.17–18). The fact that these cases all occur on f. 6r may be indicative of a lapse in concentration of the scribe here; it does not weaken the point I seek to make.

the exemplar was of a similar type to our manuscript.

There is therefore good reason to think that this *sūtrapāṭha* recension has been transmitted as such, without a commentary, for at least two generations. Nothing can of course be said with certainty about the more distant ancestors of our manuscript. However, as mentioned above, I assume that this sūtra-only transmission, though it may go back some centuries, or even more perhaps, is not one which reaches back as far as the 'original' composition/compilation of the VS. For such a transmission, without even a oral commentary, would, as I see it, mean one in which the text was not studied, the nature of the sūtras being such that one cannot seriously conceive of them being seriously studied without a written or oral commentary or commentaries.

It may be worth recalling here the nature of the manuscript as a whole; first of all the fact that it originated among Jainas and secondly the fact that it is one which contains several texts, beginning with that of the *Nyāyasūtra*.[51] My speculation is that it may form part of a tradition of study of combined Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika by Jainas, with the emphasis probably on Nyāya, given the order of texts. The sūtra-texts are placed at the beginning perhaps because of their acknowledged antiquity and the respect which was felt to be due to them, but the absence of the commentatorial literature suggests that they may not have been studied intensively. Obviously, however, it is reasonable to expect that the textual tradition must ultimately go back to a milieu of a different kind; i.e. that some ancestor of our manuscript was a codex in which a scholar who himself was not a 'specialist' copied or had copied for himself the text of the VS from a manuscript which had its origin in an environment of 'specialists,' and which was associated with a particular school of exegesis.

I now turn to an attempt to compare the sūtra text with that preserved in the three commentary versions.[52] Such a comparison is not easy to carry out objectively, and is further complicated by the fact that, in my opinion, the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has in many places not been determined with certainty. In considering this, it should be remembered that I restrict myself to the portion for which all four recensions are available, i.e. up to and including 9.8 (9.1.7 in Thakur's edition of the abridged commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) after which we no longer have any testimony to the readings known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (cf. p. 204 above).

In the following I use these abbreviations: C = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by

51 'My thesis is that when we read an Old English literary text we should take care to find out what precedes it in its manuscript state and what follows it... If a text is detached from its codicological environment (as texts normally are in our modern editions), we risk losing that part of its meaning' (Robinson 1994, 3). These remarks, though made by a specialist in a different field, are worth heeding by Indologists.

52 For a comparison with the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript see section 3.3.5.

Candrānada, BhV = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, ŚM = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra, A = the *sūtrapāṭha* reconstructed from the Ahmedabad manuscript as given in section 3.2.4 above, T = the *sūtrapāṭha* reconstructed from the Trivandrum manuscript as given in section 3.3.4 below.[53]

I begin with a collection of instances where each recension is alone in including or omitting a sūtra; for the purpose of ascertaining the relationship between the recensions this type of variation (Greg's 'type 1') has of course rather little evidential value,[54] but it is clearly important to examine these cases.

- Sūtras found in A alone.[55]

  1. A 3.2.4 *prāṇāc caikam.* In this case I think it probable that the sūtra has arisen as a result of corruption in transmission. The following sūtra begins *prāṇāpāna°* and it is quite conceivable that after copying the first two *akṣara*s of this the eye of a scribe skipped back to the previous sūtra so that he continued with the concluding *akṣara*s of that, *°c caikam*. Despite this very real possibility, I have hesitantly included the sūtra in the reconstruction as it seemed not wholly impossible to me that the corruption already existed in the hyparchetype—some sort of argument for the fact that each person has a single *manas* on the strength of the phenomenon of breath being conceivable.

- Sūtras found in C alone.

  1. 5.2.4 *tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam.* Note that this is a reprise without variation of 5.2.2, which is found in all versions except BhV.

53 The latter is not referred to consistently: for a preliminary analysis of the variants it transmits see section 3.3.5 below.

54 Cf. Greg 1927, 21–22.

55 2.2.44 is not included in this list, not so much because it is also in T but because (*pace* Jambūvijaya et al.) I believe that it, as well as 2.2.45, does belong to Candrānanda's *sūtrapāṭha* as well. Jambūvijaya prints *saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ* | 2.2.43 | *prathamāśabdaḥ sampratipattibhāvaś ceti sādṛśyād ete draṣṭavyāḥ* | (24.5–6). Note that J$^{S}_{1}$ omits what Jambūvijaya takes as the sūtra here, but also omits the preceding *sandigdhāḥ sati bahutve* 2.2.42 (cf. Jambūvijaya's notes 1 and 3 in the critical apparatus on p. 24). I propose *saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ prathamāśabdaḥ sampratipattibhāvaś ca* | 2.2.43 | *sādṛśyād ete draṣṭavyāḥ*, the *iti* after the sūtra I would regard as not actually belonging to the text (cf. the remarks apropos of Candrānanda's 1.1.29 on p. 191 above). The omission of 2.2.42 in J$^{S}_{1}$ can now be explained as resulting from eyeskip between 2.2.41 (*sampratibhāvāc ca*) and the end of 2.2.43. One could also divide 2.2.43 into three sūtras, as I have done in A (and T), for reasons explained in the brief discussion apropos of 2.2.45 on p. 239 below, but Candrānanda does not seem elsewhere to comment on a group of sūtras all together; note also that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's 2.2.40–41 are clearly taken as distinct sūtras by that commentator.

- Sūtras found in BhV alone.[56]

  1. 1.1.23 (1.1.24 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version) *tathā guṇāḥ*. Compare with 1.1.18[57] *tathā guṇaḥ*. The addition of this sūtra is in my opinion secondary, and reflects a historical development. Without it, the following sūtra would naturally be taken as an exhaustive listing of the qualities which may have more than one substance simultaneously as cause (i.e. as *samavāyikāraṇa*); although there are differences in the wording of the sūtra (A 1.1.23 ≈ C 1.1.23 ≈ BhV 1.1.24 [1.1.25 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary] ≈ ŚM 1.1.25) all versions list the same qualities: numbers from two upwards, separateness (i.e. 'multiple-separateness'), conjunction and disjunction. That even the other qualities, such as colour, are the common product of more than one substance (in that substances such as space, time and God can also be reckoned as their causes) is clearly an idea that is unlikely to be present in the earliest strata of Vaiśeṣika thought. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is so interesting as to be worth quoting in full. *yathā dvyaṇukādidravyaṃ paramāṇudvayadikkāleśvarādīnāṃ dravyāṇāṃ samānaṃ kāryam*[58] *tathā dvyaṇukādirūpādayo 'pi dvyaṇukādidikkāleśvarādidravyāṇāṃ samānaṃ kāryam ity arthaḥ* | *ātreyācāryās tu dvyaṇukādīnām ekaikadvyaṇukādidravyakāryatvānu-*

56 Note that the sūtras numbered 1.1.13 and 1.1.14 in Thakur's edition of the short version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary are not included in this listing because in my opinion they do not belong in the sūtra text at this point: they are probably to be seen as quotations in the commentary of 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. Similarly, 2.1.23 of Thakur's edition of the abridged version, *śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇa iti*, is correctly not printed as a sūtra in his edition of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary (TS 223.27–28). This passage seems to be one in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra offers some brief comments in advance on the group of sūtras 2.1.24–26. At a few points the commentary seems to need emending, however: as printed the passage runs *arthāntaranirākaraṇapūrvakaṃ gaganagocaraṃ sāmānyatodṛṣṭaṃ vyutpādayati bhagavān sūtrakāraḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvaka ityādinā* —*liṅgam ākāśasya ity anena tatra śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ* | *iti śabdaḥ* | *śabdo liṅgam ākāśasya* || 2.2.26 || *ity anenānvīyate*— (TS 223.26–30). I propose reading the passage between arrows as follows: *liṅgam ākāśasya* ***ityantena*** | *tatra śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ* (2.2.26) *iti* | ***śabdaśabdo*** (i.e. the word *śabda* in this sūtra) *liṅgam ākāśasya* (2.1.30) *ity anenānvīyate*: cf. in the abridged version *tatra śabdaśabdo liṅgam ity anenānvīyate* (23.5). In the edition of the abridged commentary there is also a significant correction that needs to be made: after the *śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇa iti* that is printed as a sūtra the manuscript has the word *vakṣyati*, a clear indication that this is not a sūtra that is meant to go here but a quotation of 2.2.26

57 Numbered 1.1.19 only in ŚM and Thakur's edition of the abridged version of BhV's commentary.

58 Read thus with the edited text of the *Tarkasāgara* version: the abridged version as edited by Thakur has *samānakāryaṃ*.

prints *aṇusaṃyogas* (47.1) where the manuscript has *ātmasaṃyogas*, which should be restored.

3. 6.2.15 *etena dveṣo vyākhyātaḥ*. Cf. footnote 29 on p. 96 above.

- Sūtras found in ŚM alone.

1. 1.1.4 *dharmaviśeṣaprasūtād dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmyavaidharmyābhyāṃ tattvajñānān niḥśreyasam*. This sūtra has been discussed not infrequently, particularly in connection with the problem of the beginning of the VS.[60] and its resemblance with a sentence in the opening section of the PDhS, *dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānāṃ ṣaṇṇāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmyavaidharmyatattvajñānaṃ niḥśreyasahetuḥ* (6.14–15), has been often remarked on. Here let me merely say that there is no good reason to regard the sūtra as old. For a different sūtra inserted in the same place in the recension represented by the Trivandrum manuscript see pp. 270 and 283 below.

2. 1.1.9 *dravyaguṇayoḥ sajātīyārambhakatvaṃ sādharmyam*. This sūtra too is likely to be secondary—it expresses very explicitly what the following sūtras teach. This is recognized by Śaṃkara Miśra himself, who rather than commenting on the sūtra immediately introduces the next one (*dravyāṇi dravyam ārabhante guṇāś ca guṇāntaram*[61]) with the words *etad eva sūtrāntareṇa spaṣṭayati* (28.11).

3. 1.1.12 *na dravyaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ ca vadhati*. This comes in the place of the sūtra *kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca* (cf. p. 238 below).

59 The last two sentences, from *ātreyācāryās tu*, are omitted in the abridged version of the commentary.

60 See especially Frauwallner 1984, Houben 1995, 714ff., and Isaacson 1995, 757–758.

61 Two sūtras in C and BhV.

7. 3.2.15 *devadatto gacchatīty upacārād abhimānāt tāvac charīrapratyakṣo 'haṃkāraḥ*. Again the manuscript Trivandrum 5346 has a variant worth noting; it reads *abhimānāc charīrapratyakṣo* for *abhimānāt tāvac charīrapratyakṣo*. Although the word *tāvat* does occur in Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary, it is by no means certain that it is a *pratīka* from the sūtra. The word *tāvat* does not occur elsewhere in the VS.
8. 3.2.16 *saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ*. A repetition of A 3.2.13 (≈ C 3.2.12 ≈ BhV 3.2.11).
9. 3.2.18 *aham iti mukhyayogyābhyāṃ śabdavad vyatirekāvyabhicārād viśeṣasiddher nāgamikaḥ*. Note that the terms *mukhya* and *yogya* do not occur elsewhere in the VS.
10. 4.2.1 *tat punar pṛthivyādikāryadravyaṃ trividhaṃ śarīrendriyaviṣayasaṃjñakam*. This improbable looking sūtra—the *punaḥ* seems inappropriate to the style of the sūtras, and indeed is not found elsewhere in the VS—is probably modelled directly or indirectly on a recurrent phrase in the PDhS; compare ***trividhaṃ*** *cāsyāḥ* (i.e. *pṛthivyāḥ*) ***kāryam, śarīrendriyaviṣayasaṃjñakam*** (27.21–22), *tāsāṃ* (i.e. *apām*) *tu* ***kāryaṃ trividhaṃ śarīrendriyaviṣayasaṃjñakam*** (36.3–4) and ***kāryaṃ*** *ca* (scil. *tejasaḥ*) ***śarīrāditrayam*** (39.3). Note however that when it comes to *vāyu* Praśastapāda writes *tatra kāryalakṣaṇaś caturvidhaḥ—śarīram indriyaṃ viṣayaḥ prāṇa iti* (44.6–7); this difference is not reflected either in the sūtra or Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary thereon.

62 The Bibliotheca Indica edition prints *dṛṣṭayātmani* and this is retained by Nozawa in his comparative table, though he reports that 'other versions' (i.e. other editions of Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary) have the reading *dṛṣṭa ātmani* or *dṛṣṭyātmani* (p. 82). *dṛṣṭa ātmani* is the reading in the text given by Gough (and incidentally also in the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript Wellcome α 301): what is more important, it is clearly supported by Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary, which begins *dṛṣṭe pratyakṣeṇa gṛhīta ātmani liṅge* (178.12). Jambūvijaya also gives this as ŚM's reading.

11. 6.1.14 *hīne pare tyāgaḥ*. Perhaps added for symmetry; the following sūtras are *sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā* 6.1.15 and *viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ* 6.1.16 (no variants). But the preceding sūtra *viruddhānāṃ tyāgaḥ* 6.1.13 (again no variants) should probably be interpreted, as Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra do, as referring to *hīnas*, and if this is the case 6.1.14 is redundant. The possibility that ŚM is 'original' here, and that the sūtra has been lost in all other versions as a result of eyeskip (caused by successive sūtras ending with *tyāgaḥ*) is in my view a very remote one.
12. 7.1.15 *karmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇaiś ca guṇā vyākhyātāḥ*. Though the content of this sūtra is hardly new, the other versions do not have it at this place,[63] and it is unusual in having the words *ca* and *vyākhyātāḥ* in it. Compare A's 7.1.25 (cf. p. 250 below).
13. 7.2.5 *bhrāntaṃ tat*. Perhaps interpolated from a commentary; the terminology *bhrānta*/*bhrānti* does not occur elsewhere in the VS, nor even in the PDhS.

- Sūtras omitted only in A.

  1. C 2.1.21 ≈ BhV 2.1.21 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.20 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.21.
  2. C 2.1.22 ≈ BhV 2.1.22 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.21 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.22.
  3. C 2.1.23 ≈ BhV 2.1.23 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.22 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.23.

  The omission of this group of sūtras has no obvious mechanical cause; taking their content into account, it seems an interesting and significant case. For it is in these sūtras that arguments are given against a view, put forward in 2.1.20, that holds going out and entering (*niṣkramaṇa* and *praveśana*) to be an inferential mark from which the existence of ether as a separate substance can be inferred. The following three sūtras, 2.1.24–26, put forward sound as an inferential mark serving the same purpose. Now considerations related to the question of the development of the way in which the Vaiśeṣika conceived of sound led Bronkhorst to conclude that all six sūtras, 2.1.21–26, have been 'added onto another, older inferential mark [i.e. that put forward in 2.1.20] meant to prove the existence of ether' (1993b, 81), though he

63 One could however regard it as having been 'moved,' and as corresponding to A 7.1.24–25 ≈ C 7.1.24 ≈ BhV 7.1.26–27.

also remarks that 2.1.26, which seems to be referred to by Bhartṛhari, 'appears to be old' (op. cit., 84). A's reading of the passage now appears to fit quite well with the assumption that Bronkhorst's theory is correct; it would seem then to preserve an earlier stage than any other version, one in which the older inferential mark was still accepted next to the more recently developed idea of sound as a quality that proves the existence of ether as its substratum.

4. C 4.1.8 ≈ BhV 4.1.7 ≈ ŚM 4.1.7. Note that homoeoteleuton may be involved (cf. the remark on C 4.1.7 on p. 241 below)
5. C 6.2.15 ≈ BhV 6.2.14 ≈ ŚM 6.2.12. One could also regard this sūtra, *adṛṣṭāt* in Candrānanda's text, *adṛṣṭāc ca* in that of the other two commentators, as having been telescoped with A 6.2.16 *adṛṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ*, for which C (6.2.16) and BhV (6.2.16) have *jātiviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ* and ŚM (6.2.13) simply *jātiviśeṣaḥ*.

- Sūtras omitted only in C.
  1. A 3.1.7 ≈ BhV 3.1.9 ≈ ŚM 3.1.8. This is a slightly dubious case; one manuscript (J_1^S, referred to as PS by Jambūvijaya) does have the sūtra (cf. the *vṛddhipatraka* of Jambūvijaya's edition, 228.13–229.3).
  2. A 4.2.4 *tad ayonijaṁ* ≈ BhV 4.2.5 *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca* ≈ ŚM 4.2.5 *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca*.

- Sūtras omitted only in BhV.[64]
  1. A 2.2.40 ≈ C 2.2.40 ≈ ŚM 2.2.34.
  2. A 3.1.14 ≈ C 3.1.12 ≈ ŚM 3.1.16–17.
  3. A 3.2.12 ≈ C 3.2.11 ≈ ŚM 3.2.12.
  4. A 3.2.18 ≈ C 3.2.17 ≈ ŚM 3.2.21.
  5. A 4.1.4 ≈ C 4.1.4 ≈ ŚM 4.1.4.
  6. A 4.2.10 ≈ C 4.2.9 ≈ ŚM 4.2.10–11.
  7. 5.1.2 (in all other versions).
  8. 5.1.12 (in all other versions).

64 I suspect, without however being able to offer clinching arguments, that the omission of 2.2.7–8 (of all other versions) is due to error in transmission and does not go back to the hyparchetype of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*; for this reaon they are not included in the list below. Certainly there is nothing in their content or wording that would have been unacceptable to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. Note that the evidence of the long version of the commentary is unfortunately unavailable here, due to a lacuna in Thakur's transcript(s).

9. 5.2.2 (in all other versions).
10. A 5.2.8 ≈ C 5.2.9 ≈ ŚM 5.2.8.
11. A 5.2.14 ≈ C 5.2.15 ≈ ŚM 5.2.14.
12. A 5.2.21 ≈ C 5.2.22 ≈ ŚM 5.2.20.
13. A 5.2.25 ≈ C 5.2.26 ≈ ŚM 5.2.24.
14. A 6.1.11 ≈ C 6.1.11 ≈ ŚM 6.1.8.
15. A 6.2.11 ≈ C 6.2.10 ≈ ŚM 6.2.8.[65]
16. A 6.2.14 ≈ C 6.2.13 ≈ ŚM 6.2.11.
17. A 6.2.17 ≈ C 6.2.17 ≈ ŚM 6.2.14.
18. A 7.2.21 ≈ C 7.2.18 ≈ ŚM 7.2.17.
19. A 8.1.5 ≈ C 8.5 ≈ ŚM 8.1.5.
20. A 9.2 ≈ C 9.2 ≈ ŚM 9.1.2.

- Sūtras omitted only in ŚM.

  1. 1.1.11 (in all other versions but T, where it is 1.1.12) *kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca*. In place of this ŚM has its unique 1.1.12: cf. p. 234 above.
  2. 1.2.9 (in all other versions).[66]
  3. A 2.2.9 ≈ C 2.2.9 ≈ BhV 2.2.7[67]
  4. A 2.2.20 ≈ C 2.2.20 ≈ BhV 2.2.18.[68]
  5. A 2.2.32 ≈ C 2.2.32 ≈ BhV 2.2.34.[69]
  6. A 2.2.39 ≈ C 2.2.39 ≈ BhV 2.2.33.[70]

65 In ŚM this sūtra and A's 6.2.10 ≈ C 6.2.9 are read together as a single sūtra.

66 Though omitted in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, the sūtra is found as 1.2.9 in the full version (TS 187.1).

67 This is the numbering in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; in his edition of the long version he numbers it 2.2.9, but note that the transcript(s) of the long version lack the opening of this *āhnika*.

68 Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; 2.2.20 in his edition of the full version.

69 Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the long version; lacking in the edition of the abridged version.

70 Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; 2.2.39 in his edition of the long version.

7. A 2.2.45 ≈ C 2.2.45[71] ≈ BhV 2.2.42. Note that it would be possible to take this sūtra with the preceding one (or two) as a single sūtra. However, I have chosen to divide thuus, in accordance with the fact that 2.2.39–41 appear to be separate sūtras in all recensions, and 2.2.43–45 mirror the earlier group, with nominatives replaceing the ablatives; the facts adduced by an opponent to prove that sound/word is eternal can all be explained simple *sāmānyataḥ* (2.2.43).
8. A 4.2.7 ≈ C 4.2.6 ≈ BhV 4.2.8.
9. A 5.2.17 ≈ C 5.2.18 ≈ BhV 5.2.16.
10. 6.1.2 (in all other versions).
11. 6.1.6 (in all other versions).
12. 6.1.8 (in all other versions).
13. A 6.2.15 ≈ C 6.2.14 ≈ BhV 6.2.13.
14. 7.1.2 (in all other versions).
15. 7.1.3 (in all other versions).
16. 7.1.6 (in all other versions).
17. A 7.1.11 ≈ C 7.1.11 ≈ BhV 7.1.12–13.
18. A 7.1.12 ≈ C 7.1.12 ≈ BhV 7.1.14.
19. A 7.1.13 ≈ C 7.1.13 ≈ BhV 7.1.15.
20. A 7.1.24 ≈ C 7.1.24 ≈ BhV 7.1.26.
21. A 7.1.25 ≈ C 7.1.24[72] ≈ BhV 7.1.27.
22. A 7.2.3 ≈ C 7.2.2 ≈ BhV 7.2.3.
23. A 7.2.4 ≈ C 7.2.3 ≈ BhV 7.2.4.
24. A 7.2.6 ≈ C 7.2.5 ≈ BhV 7.2.6.
25. A 7.2.7 ≈ C 7.2.5[73] ≈ BhV 7.2.7.
26. A 7.2.25 ≈ C 7.2.22 ≈ BhV 7.2.23.
27. A 7.2.26 ≈ C 7.2.23 ≈ BhV 7.2.24.

71 Absent in Jambūvijaya's edition, but I believe it belongs in Candrānanda's *sūtrapāṭha*: cf. footnote 55 on p. 232 above. If I am mistaken in this, this sūtra would fall under the heading of sūtras found in A and BhV but omitted in C and ŚM. T also testifies to the presence of the sūtra.

72 Note that what in BhV is two sūtras (7.1.26–27) is a single sūtra in C, and that the decision to take as two sūtras in A is a fairly arbitrary one.

73 Again, what in BhV is two sūtras (7.2.6–7) is a single sūtra in C, and the decision to take as two sūtras in A is more or less an arbitrary one.

28. A 8.1.12 ≈ C 8.11 ≈ BhV 8.1.11.[74]

From the data presented above it may be seen that all forms of type 1 variants are to be found, as was no doubt to be expected. What immediately catches the eye, however, is the fact that BhV and ŚM are so much more often alone in inclusion and especially omission of sūtras than the other two recensions are. Most, though perhaps not all, of these isolated readings are probably secondary, but the significance of this is perhaps different in the two cases. In that of ŚM the text commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra has probably been established with a fair degree of accuracy, and the errors belong to the hyparchetype. In that of BhV, however, I have strong suspicions that the deterioration largely post-dates the composition of the commentary, in other words that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself had a *sūtrapāṭha* with fewer unique readings (especially omissions) than would appear from the text as we now have it. This is supported by the fact that the publication of the full version of the commentary already allows us to see that the text of the first two *adhyāyas* known to him was less deviant than it appeared when all that we had to go on was Thakur's edition of the abridged version.

Next let us look at variants of type 2, i.e. agreements between two sources, on the level of inclusion and omission of sūtras.

- Sūtras found in A and C, but lacking in BhV and ŚM.

    1. A 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ* ≈ C 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ karma guṇa iti saṃśayaḥ.*[75] The word-order in A is a little more natural than in C.
    2. A 2.2.33 *śabdavyañjaka abhāvāt* ≈ C 2.2.33 *abhāvāt*. Cf. p. 244 below.

- Sūtras found in A and BhV but lacking in C and ŚM. No cases found.

- Sūtras found in A and ŚM but lacking in C and BhV. No cases found.

- Sūtras found in C and BhV but lacking in A and ŚM.

    1. C 4.1.7 *adravyavattvāt paramāṇāv anupalabdhiḥ* ≈ BhV 4.1.6 (same reading).[76] In this case, it must be considered a possibility that this sūtra

74 Not recognized as a sūtra by Thakur, but following after the sūtra which he numbers [illegible] in his edition of the abridged version (77.1).

75 Nozawa tentatively suggests that *kim ayaṃ dravyaṃ guṇa karma veti* in the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary (31.16) may correspond to this. However it seems, also from the text of the full version of the commentary, though that is partly damaged here, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra did not have a corresponding sūtra (see TS 246.23–29 and Thakur's footnote on this page).

76 On the reading known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra see footnote 45 on p. 113 above.

as well as the following one (C 4.1.8 ≈ Bh 4.1.7 ≈ ŚM 4.1.7) has been lost in A and/or ŚM due to eyeskip provoked by homoeoteleuton, as there is a series of sūtras starting from C's 4.1.6 and running through C's 4.1.9 which all end with °*palabdhiḥ*.On the other hand, perhaps the sūtra may have been interpolated; note above all that it is the only sūtra in any version of the VS to contain the word *paramāṇu* (see for further discussion Isaacson 1990, 33–34).

- Sūtras found in C and ŚM but lacking in A and BhV.

    1. C 4.1.9 *anekadravyeṇa dravyeṇa samavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc copalabdhiḥ* ≈ ŚM 4.1.8 *anekadravyasamavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ*. Again, homoeoteleuton must be reckoned with, as with C's 4.1.7 (see above).

- Sūtras found in BhV and ŚM but lacking in A and C. No instances found.

The number of cases involved is so small that these data must of course be treated very cautiously, but the first impression from this is that A is most closely related to C.

Before moving to the consideration of some individual readings the question of organization of the sūtras should perhaps briefly be mentioned. The point of interest concerns the last three *adhyāyas*. While all recensions agree in dividing the first 7 *adhyāyas* into two *āhnikas*, and agree also in where these *adhyāyas* are to be divided, they all differ with respect to the organization of *adhyāyas* 8–10. Candrānanda does not divide them at all, and in this he is supported by the brief summary of the VS given in Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* (85.12–86.2). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and Śaṃkara Miśra divide the eighth and ninth *adhyāyas* into two *āhnikas*, but differ in both cases as to the point of division. Our manuscript also divides the eighth *adhyāya*, but at another point yet, while it has no such division of the ninth. For the tenth *adhyāya* we have no evidence as to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's text, but, as in the ninth, ŚM has two *āhnikas*. The Ahmedabad manuscript this time also divides, but, as in the eighth *adhyāya*, at a different place from ŚM. In this case, in fact, the division seems a particularly unequal one, with the second *āhnika* being reduced to only two sūtras—the two reprises of earlier sūtras with which the VS ends: *dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya* (no variants) occurs earlier as 6.2.1, while the final sūtra *tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam* (ŚM alone reads *tadvacanād āmnāyasya prāmāṇyam*) is VS 1.1.3.

This points again to the independance of A from the other recensions, and it could be argued that once more the evidence suggests that it is C to which A is closest, in as much as at least in the case of the ninth *adhyāya* the two agree in having

no division in *āhnika*s. Incidentally, the fact that all versions which do divide any of these last *adhyāya*s do so in different places is strong support for the assumption that any such division is a secondary attempt to make these *adhyāyas* conform in their outward organization to *adhyāya*s 1–7.

In dealing, as we shall now attempt to, with variants in the readings of sūtras, the practical and methodological difficulties involved increase considerably. First of all, the poor quality of both transmission and edition of both versions of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary causes problems which cannot be resolved at present, and this therefore risks distorting our results. When looking at the finer level of wording, this risk is even greater than when the inclusion or omission of sūtras is the basis of comparison. In addition, if one tries for example to count agreements and disagreements between recensions, one must be aware of the extent to which figures which give the impression of exactness are in fact influenced by choices which are partly arbitrary, in particular the choice of variation-units;[77] thus if one chooses to count once each *akṣara* that differs, the numbers produced will be markedly different from those resulting from a count based on the number of words which vary or one which takes the sūtra as the basic unit, as I shall do in the following.

For these reasons, it is best not to accord much weight to the precise number of cases of each type of variation listed in the pages that follow. I begin with a collection of those sūtras where A differs from all three commentary-recensions, with some brief comment being given in most cases. After that the sūtras where A agrees in reading with each recension alone are collected. In the case of BhV, however, only those cases are taken up in the list where I feel that the reading accepted by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has been established with a strong degree of certainty. Similarly, it must be born in mind that some cases where A seems to agree with C alone are not listed as such because I believe that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, despite the reading ascribed to him in Thakur's edition(s), also had the same text.

These caveats having been given, let us look at the data. As before, I restrict myself to the portion of the VS for which the testimony of all three commentaries is available, i.e. up to A 9.8.

- Sūtras in which A's readings are unique.[78]

    1. 1.1.14 *kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇaṃ dravyam; iti dravyalakṣaṇam.* All other versions omit *dravyam*, in which case the structure of the sūtra

77 One is surprised how often this methodological point is left unmentioned by those whom it affects most: those who in classifying manuscripts and drawing up a *stemma codicum* rely heavily on statistics of patterns of agreement.

78 Some of these readings are in fact shared with the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript treated in the following section (T): for a list of these see p. 298f. below.

is more closely parallel to the following sūtras which give the *lakṣaṇa* of quality and motion. The variant may go back to the hyparchetype, but with no further support for it, there is no reason to think it original.

2. 1.1.24 *asamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ kāryaṃ karma na vidyate.* The difference with the other recensions, none of which agree, is fairly trivial: C has *asamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ karma kāryaṃ na vidyate*, BhV *asamavāyāt kāryaṃ karma na vidyate* and ŚM *asamavāyāt sāmānyakāryaṃ karma na vidyate.*

3. 1.2.9 *ekadravyatvān na dravyam.* C and possibly BhV[79] read *ekadravyavattvān na dravyam.* ŚM omits. A's reading is perfectly possible and is most unlikely to be an error by the scribe, as A is appears always to use the terms *adravyatva,*[80] *ekadravyatva*[81] and *anekadravyatva*[82] instead of *adravyavattva* and so on. Unlike the versions we have with a commentary, A is consistent in this respect.[83] One explanation of this fact would be to take this as a sign of activity by a redactor who deliberately wished to remove inconsistencies which might perhaps be 'original,' and could even be in some cases an indication of different layers of composition. But I am not sure if this is the case—for one thing the commentators do not agree with each other in the reading of all these sūtras, and furthermore it could be argued that the addition of a *vat* in some cases may have been a secondary attempt to remove an ambiguity. The addition does not affect the sense, for all of these compounds are to be taken as bahuvrīhi adjectives.

4. 1.2.12 *ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam.* The versions of the com-

79 Thakur's edition of the short version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary does not have the sūtra as such, but Jambūvijaya, who is followed in this by Nozawa, takes the ***tenaikadravyavṛttitvād*** *ākāśakāladigātmāśritatvād ity arthaḥ* printed as part of the commentary to 1.2.8 (16.11–12) as an indication that the corresponding sūtra in BhV should read *ekadravyavṛttitvān na dravyam.* In the *Tarkasāgara* Thakur prints as a sūtra numbered 1.2.9 *ekadravya[vṛttitvāt] sattā na dravyam*: the use of square brackets may be taken as an indication that the transcript(s) used by him are corrupt or otherwise defective here. The commentary however includes, corresponding to the fragment of the abridged commentary quoted above, ***tenaikadravyavattvād*** *ity ākāśāśritatvāt, kālāśritatvāt, digāśritatvāt, dravyatvāvāntarajātirahitāśritatvāt, ākāśādiguṇavad iti sūtrārthaḥ* (TS 187.17–19), and—rightly or wrongly—I place a little more reliance on this than on the transmission of the abridged commentary.

80 2.1.11 (see p. 244 below) and 2.1.13 (see p. 255 below).

81 1.2.12 (cf. below), 2.2.27 (here agreeing with BhV and ŚM, with only C reading *ekadravyavattvān na dravyam*) and 7.1.14.

82 4.1.6: see p. 247 below.

83 This consistency is also found in the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript discussed in the following section (T).

mentators have *ekadravyavattvena* for *ekadravyatvena*. See the discussion apropos of 1.2.9 above.

5. 2.1.11 *adravyatvād dravyam*. C and BhV have *adravyavattvād* for *adravyatvād*, whereas ŚM reads *adravyavattvena*. Again I refer the reader to the remarks made on p. 243 above apropos of 1.2.9.
6. 2.1.12 *kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ceti*. The versions followed by the commentators[84] have *ca* for *ceti*. Since there is no obvious reason for the *iti* to have been secondarily added—it does not precede a colophon—I have retained it in the reconstruction; it is possible that it goes back to the hyparchetype, although I am not sure what function it would have had there. It may however be possible that the *iti* is a trace of the original process of extracting the sūtras from a commentary, i.e. that an *iti* with which the commentator had quoted the sūtra was mistaken as belonging to the *mūla*-text.
7. 2.1.20 *niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgatvāt*. All other versions read *liṅgam* for *liṅgatvāt*. I am not sure how the ablative is to be interpreted, if it is hyparchetypal.
8. 2.2.10 *nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt*. The *ca* is omitted in the versions of all the commentators. It is likely to be secondary; a syntatical tag added to make the structure of the sūtra clear and unambiguous.
9. 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ*. For *guṇaḥ karmeti* C reads *karma guṇa iti*; the other two commentaries do not have the sūtra. Cf. p. 240 above.
10. 2.2.33 *śabdavyañjaka abhāvāt*. C has merely *abhāvāt*; the other commentators omit the sūtra. As being more explicit, A's reading may be secondary, perhaps originating from a commentary. This does not however seem to have been Candrānanda's, although the word *vyañjaka* does occur here in his commentary, or, more precisely, in the words which introduce the following sūtra.[85] Interestingly, A's variant is here supported by the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript; see p. 292 below.
11. 3.1.2 *indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntare hetuḥ*. C and BhV[86] have *'rthāntaratve* and ŚM *'rthāntarasya* for *'rthāntare*, which however seems syntactically perfectly possible.

84 Though lacking in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, the sūtra can be found in the full version, numbered 2.1.12 in Thakur's edition (TS 21.8 1)

85 The commentary runs *prāgabhāvād ity arthaḥ | prāgabhāvavato vināśāt | prāgabhāvas ... kā-raṇebhya utpatteḥ | na ca tāni vyañjakāni | kutaḥ*— 22.14.

86 As I have remarked elsewhere (Isaacson 1995, 773–774), the reading given in Thakur's edition

12. 3.1.4 *kāraṇānām ajñānāt.* All other versions read a compound *kāraṇājñānāt*, which makes the sūtra parallel the following one, *kāryājñānāt* in all versions except ŚM which has *kāryeṣu jñānāt*, more closely. A's reading is doubtless secondary, but conceivably hyparchetypal.
13. 3.1.12 *prasiddho 'padeśaḥ.* All other versions[87] have two negatives, *aprasiddho 'napadeśaḥ.*
14. 3.1.14 *viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti.* C adds *ca* at the end of the sūtra, BhV does not have it (cf. p. 237 above), and ŚM splits into two sūtras reading *yasmād viṣāṇī tasmād aśvaḥ* 3.1.16, *yasmād viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti cānaikāntikasyodāharaṇam* 3.1.17.
15. 3.1.16 *pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam.* All the commentators read a *ca* after *pravṛttinivṛttī.*
16. 3.2.3 *prayatnajñānāyaugapadyāc caikam.* BhV and C read *prayatnāyaugapadyāj jñānāyaugapadyāc caikaṃ manaḥ*, ŚM reads as they do but omitting the *manaḥ.*[88] The *manaḥ* could be regarded as over-explicit, as without it it is clear enough what the subject is from 3.2.1. As for the other variant, it is interesting to note that Praśastapāda refers to the sūtra as authority for the fact that there is only one *manaḥ* per person with the word *prayatnajñānāyaugapadyavacanāt pratiśarīram ekatvaṃ siddham* (89.13–14), though one should no doubt be cautious in drawing conclusions when a sūtra is referred to in this slightly loose fashion, obviously not a direct quotation. Of the commentators on this PDhS passage, only Udayana quotes the sūtra with the compound, in the form *prayatnajñānāyaugapadyād ekaṃ manaḥ* (KĀ 102.2). Udayana's reading is thus anomalous; perhaps he is quoting from memory here.
17. 3.2.10 *nāham iti śabdavyatirekāt.* C *aham iti śabdavyatirekān nāgamikam*, BhV *aham iti śabdavyatirekeṇa nāgāmikam*, ŚM *aham iti śabdasya vyatirekān nāgamikam.* A's reading conveys the same sense as

of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary must be corrected on two points; for *indriyārthaprasiddher* read *indriyārthaprasiddhir* and for *'rthāntare* read *'rthāntaratve*. As to the former point, the arguments I adduced before may be supplemented by a further one; from the *idam evottaram* with which the commentary on 3.2.2 ends (or rather with which 3.2.3 is introduced) it may be concluded that actually 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 are supposed to be the same sūtra, which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes us to read (partly at least) twice, by *āvṛtti*. And 3.2.2, as printed by Thakur, runs *indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyaḥ*. Obviously the entire passage as edited needs considerable revision.

87 In ŚM the sūtra is combined into one with the following *asan sandigdhaś cānapadeśaḥ*.

88 Thus the editions and Wellcome α301, but Trivandrum 5346 does have the word. Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary does not allow the point to be settled.

the other versions, but may be a secondary attempt to be more brief. Note that there are no other sūtras with the same structure of a negation followed by an argument for the negation expressed by a noun in the ablative case.[89]

18. 3.2.11 *yadi ca pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti.* All versions differ, C having *yadi ca dṛṣṭaprat yakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti*, BhV *yadi ca draṣṭuḥ pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadattaḥ* and ŚM *yadi dṛṣṭam anvakṣam ahaṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti.* Here it seems possible that both BhV and ŚM have corruptions of the reading found in C,[90] so perhaps A's reading is also secondary—it could either have arisen involuntarily or be an 'improvement,' as the compound *dṛṣṭapratyakṣa* may well have been felt to be somewhat awkward and pleonastic. But perhaps it cannot be wholly ruled out that A preserves an original reading here, for the compound in C could be an admittedly somewhat clumsy attempt to be more explicit, or the result of incorporation of a marginal gloss. This latter possibility must however be for the time being regarded as a remote one, as it implies a relationship between C, BhV and ŚM for which other evidence seems to be lacking.

19. 3.2.12 *devadatto gacchatīti viṣṇumitro gacchatīti copacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ.* For the first *gacchatīti* C has merely *gacchati.* BhV omits.[91] ŚM *devadatto gacchati yajñadatto gacchatīty upacārāc charīre pratyayaḥ.*

20. 3.2.17 *nānāvasthātaḥ.* C has *nānā vyavasthātaḥ* and ŚM *vyavasthāto nānā*, while the equivalent words in BhV are joined with the preceding sūtra, which then reads *sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmye na vyavasthā.* A's reading may go back to that found in C, but it seems possible that the divergence, if the direction of change is indeed this way, was already present in the hyparchetype.

89 This holds at least for the *sūtrapāṭha* versions of C and A. BhV alone reads 6.2.13 (A's 6.2.15) *na tṛpteḥ* (the others omit the *na*), and ŚM alone reads 2.2.24 (A's 2.2.28) *nāpi karmādikāraṇatvāt.* It is possible that the same syntactical structure occurs in a sūtra found in T alone, but the reading, interpretation and even division is uncertain; see p. 285 below.

90 Unlike Honda (1993, 294), I do not find BhV's reading confidence-inspiring. C's reading is by no means easy to interpret, but as shown by Oetke (1988, 325–331) it need not be taken as Candrānanda understands it, and it may well be original.

91 Jambūvijaya (1961, 110) apparently thinks that the sūtra should be added to the BhV *sūtrapāṭha*, but it is not found in the manuscript, and I see no certain signs in the commentary that it was known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, though as almost always it is possible that a mishap has occurred in the process of abridgement or transmission.

21. 4.1.6 *mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ*. All the commentators read *anekadravyavattvād* for *anekadravyatvād*. Cf. the remarks apropos of 1.2.9 on p. 243 above.

22. 4.1.11 *etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam.* For *sārvendriyajñānaṃ* C reads *sarvendriyajñānaṃ* and BhV and ŚM *sarvendriyaṃ jñānaṃ*. Note however that manuscript J_1 of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS has *sārvvemdriyajñānaṃ*, agreeing with A.

23. 4.2.2 *guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyātmakam api na*. C reads *tryātmakam* for *dvyātmakam*, ŚM reads *na tryātmakam* for *dvyātmakam api na* and BhV apparently reads *dvyātmakaṃ tryātmakam api.*[92]

24. 4.2.3 *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām*. C as edited by Jambūvijaya reads *avipratiṣiddho* for *apratiṣiddho*, but note that the Śāradā manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary have *ātmasaṃyogas tu pratiṣiddho* which is probably a misreading for *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho* as in A. BhV reads *ātmasaṃyogaś ca pratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām* and follows this with, it appears, another sūtra reading *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām* (cf. p. 234 above). ŚM is printed as reading *aṇusaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddhaḥ* but the words *mithaḥ pañcānām* at the conclusion of this are found in both Trivandrum 5346 and Wellcome α301, and, as was pointed out more than half a century ago by Kaviraj (1929, 74), Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary suggests that he indeed had them in his text.

25. 4.2.4 *tad ayonijam*. C does not have the sūtra; BhV reads *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca* and ŚM *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca*. A has certainly the *lectio brevior* (*et difficilior*); it is conceivable that it underlies the explicitly developed sūtras of BhV and ŚM. Whatever its reading, the sūtra is not beyond suspicion; there is no apparent reason for its being left out in C if it is original. It is also omitted in T; see the brief discussion on p. 289 below.

26. 5.1.1 *ātmaprayatnasaṃyogābhyāṃ haste karma*. All the commentators have *ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ* for *ātmaprayatnasaṃyogābhyāṃ*. In favour of A's order one could adduce A 1.1.27 ≈ C 1.1.27 ≈ BhV 1.1.28[93] ≈ ŚM 1.1.29 *gurutva**prayatnasaṃyogā**nām utkṣepaṇam* (no

92 Thus the MS: *tryātmakam api* [*na*] in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, accepted by Jambūvijaya and Nozawa.

93 Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary: 1.1.29 in his edition of the abridged version.

variants), while the other word-order could be defended on the basis of the fact that in the list of qualities in 1.1.5 (1.1.6 in ŚM alone) all versions have *saṃyoga* as the eighth and *prayatna* as the seventeenth item.

27. 5.1.17 *nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma tatkāritāc cottaram tathottaram uttaram ca.* For *tatkāritāc cottaram* C has *karmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaram* and BhV and ŚM *tatkarmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaram.* There is no obvious cause for eyeskip here, and A's reading is clearly the least explicit, so it is conceivable that the commentators all have a text which is an attempt to clarify it.

28. 5.2.1 *nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāt pṛthivyāṃ karma.* For *nodanābhighātāt* C reads *nodanād abhighātāt*; all commentators read *saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca* for *saṃyuktasaṃyogāt.*

29. 5.2.11 *apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca.* C and BhV add *stanayitnuḥ* and ŚM adds *stanayitnoḥ* at the end.

30. 5.2.15–16 are best treated together, especially since the decision of how to divide into sūtras was partly an arbitrary one. *ātmendriyamanortha-saṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe* 5.2.15, *tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.16. C *ātmendriyamanortha-sannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe tadanārambhaḥ* 5.2.16. *ātmasthe manasi saśarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ sa yogaḥ* 5.2.17; BhV [*ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe*][94] 5.2.12, *tadanārambhaś cātmasthe manasi*[95] 5.2.13, *saśarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ* 5.2.14, *saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.15; ŚM *ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe* 5.2.15, *tadanārambhaś cātmasthamanasi śarīrasya duḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.16. A's readings are not particularly good here, sharing *śarīrasya* with ŚM alone and reading *saṃyogaḥ* with BhV and ŚM against C's *sa yogaḥ*; Wezler's study of these sūtras concluded that both these readings are secondary as compared with Candrānanda's text (Wezler 1982a, 650–663).

31. 5.2.19 *dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamaḥ.*

94 This sūtra is lacking in the manuscript and has been supplied by Thakur on the basis of the commentary and ŚM's *sūtrapāṭha*.

95 Jambūvijaya already corrected the text to read thus, from the ... *cātmasthe manasi* of Thakur's edition, and Wezler (1982a, 680 n. 63) remarked that the commentary clearly supports this reading. Nozawa retains Thakur's reading, thus, as often, forming a step backward rather than forward. It can now be reported that the manuscript indeed has the correct *cātmasthe manasi*. No doubt Thakur 'corrected' this, as he so often does, to agree with ŚM; this would be less reprehensible a procedure had it not been carried out silently.

C reads *dravyaguṇakarmavaidharmyād bhāvābhāvamātraṃ tamaḥ*, BhV is closest to A, differing only in having *bhābhāvas* for *bhāsa abhāvas*,[96] and ŚM has *abhāvas* instead.

32. 5.2.20 *tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca tamaḥ*. All other versions omit *tamaḥ*, taking the word as still applying through *anuvṛtti* from (A's) 5.2.19. The more explicit reading of A is thus likely to be secondary.

33. 6.1.1 *buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedaḥ*. Though this reading is also found in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, I have there felt it necessary to emend *vedaḥ* to *vede*, as in the other commentators' text. In itself, however, the reading *vedaḥ* seems not impossible. See the discussion in footnote 3 on p. 78 above.

34. 6.1.3 *tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam*. C has *°siddhir liṅgam*, while BhV and ŚM agree with A on this point but omit *tathā*.

35. 6.1.6 *tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām*. For *tayos tu* C has *tayoḥ* and BhV *tayoś ca*; ŚM does not have the sūtra. The fact that A has a different particle from BhV may be seen as confirmation that C's reading is the oldest; it has been 'elaborated' differently in A and BhV.

36. 6.1.11 *tatsamabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ*. For *tatsamabhivyāhārato* C has simply *samabhivyāhārato* and ŚM *tasya samabhivyāhārato*; the sūtra is not found in BhV. C's reading is likely to be once more the source of the other two, more explicit ones.

37. 6.2.11 *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya*. C has *cānarthāntaratvād* for *cārthāntaratvād*. BhV omits the sūtra and ŚM, who as just remarked reads this together with the previous sūtra, has *vārthāntaratvād* instead of *cārthāntaratvād*. The interpretation of the entire passage is most difficult—there is no unanimity among the commentators. For a few remarks from which the complexity of the problem may at least be gathered see the comments on T's 6.2.13–14 on pp. 284ff. below.

38. 6.2.16 *adṛṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ*. C and BhV have *jātiviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ* and ŚM simply *jātiviśeṣāc ca*. As remarked above (p. 237) it is possible that two sūtras have been telescoped as a result of post-hyparchetype corruption, but the error, if it is that, may also have existed in the hyparchetype, as the sūtra can be interpreted well enough as transmitted.

96 Thus the manuscript, and the commentary clearly supports the reading. Unfortunately, although he realized and even remarked on this fact (see page 9 of his English introduction), Thakur printed *abhāvas*, giving too much weight to ŚM, and Jambūvijaya and Nozawa have retained this.

39. 7.1.17 *viparītam aṇu*. C and BhV read *tadviparītam aṇu* and ŚM *ato viparītam aṇu*. As the least explicit reading, it is possible that *viparītam aṇu* is the most original form, which has been amplified independently in the texts of the commentators.

40. 7.1.18 *aṇu mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca*. For *ekasmin* all other versions have *tasmin*, which the commentators understand as meaning 'with regard to a [single] object,' i.e., *de facto*, *ekasmin*. A's reading is therefore most likely secondary, as an unsupported *lectio facilior*, but it is perfectly possible that it was present in the hyparchetype (if it is not a variant that arose under the influence of the hypothetical commentary accompanying the hyparchetype).

41. 7.1.25 *guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ*. All other versions[97] have simply *guṇair* for *guṇaiś ca*, and this is also A's reading at 7.2.7, 7.2.16 and 7.2.32. The reading may however be hyparchetypal; it is worth noting that ŚM's 7.1.15 (for which the other versions have no equivalent at the same place) reads *karmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇaiś ca guṇā vyākhyātāḥ* (cf. p. 236 above).

42. 7.2.21 *asati nāstīti prayogāt*. C and ŚM—BhV appears not to have the sūtra—both add *ca* before *prayogāt*.

43. 7.2.26 *sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*. C reads *sambaddhasambandhād* for *sambandhisambandhād*, BhV probably omits the word (see discussion in footnote 51 on p. 133 above) and ŚM omits the entire sūtra. A's reading seems intrinsically possible; it can be interpreted to mean the same as the C reading.

44. 7.2.29 *kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇātvāc paratvāparatve*. All the commentators omit *paratvāparatve*. A's reading may go back to the hyparchetype, but is doubtless secondary (unnecessarily explicit) in comparison with the text of the commentators. It is however shared with T (cf. p. 299 below).

45. 8.1.4 *guṇakarmasv asaṃnivṛtteṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca*. For *guṇakarmasv asaṃnivṛtteṣu* Candrānanda and BhV[98] read *guṇakarmasv asaṃnikṛṣṭeṣu* and ŚM *guṇakarmasu saṃnikṛṣṭeṣu*. I have argued elsewhere that Candrānanda's reading is the oldest form of this sūtra (cf. Isaacson 1990, 46–47);[99] A is interesting

97 Note that Candrānanda treats this together with the preceding sūtra as a single sūtra.

98 Not in the edition by Thakur, who has once more silently 'corrected' to agree with ŚM, but in the manuscript.

99 A different opinion is expressed by Nozawa (1993b, 1156(7)–1155(8)), but I find his arguments

here both in retaining the negative *a* lost in BhV and ŚM and in that its reading may attest to another—admittedly unconvincing—solution found of the exegetical difficulty which the development in the notion of *saṃnikarṣa* and Vaiśeṣika ontology created. One can imagine that our hypothetical commentator explained *asaṃnivṛtteṣu* as meaning 'while [the qualities and actions] have not [yet] been destroyed.' No occurrences of *saṃni√vṛt* are to be found in any version of the VS.

46. 8.1.9 *samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kārya-kāraṇabhūte iti*. None of the other versions has the concluding *iti*; BhV reads *chvaityabuddheś ca* for *chvaityabuddheḥ* and ŚM *te ete* for *ete*.

47. 8.1.12 *guṇakarmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt*. C reads *tathā dravyaguṇa-karmasu kāraṇāviśeṣāt* and BhV *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇavi-śeṣāt*;[100] ŚM omits. A's omission of *tathā dravya°* may well belong to the hyparchetype; not only is there no obvious cause for mechanical omission but the sūtra thus forms a clear parallel to 8.1.10–11. Those sūtras (or that sūtra—it is a moot point whether to divide or not) apparently teach that cognitions of substances which are not related as qualifier and qualified do not cause each other. It then might seem superficially at least smoother to continue with a sūtra arguing that this applies too to cognitions of qualities and motions (which cannot be thus related) rather than one which again refers to cognitions of substances as well as of qualities and motions.

48. 8.2.3 *tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*. For *rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt* C reads *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*, BhV *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu* (with *rasarūpa-sparśāt* as a separate sūtra)[101] and ŚM *rasarūpasparśāviśeṣāt*. A's reading, unsupported, seems unlikely to be original, but the *rasanād-diṣu* is an interesting *lectio facilior*; Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra agree that the expression *gandhajñāna* in the previous sūtra[102] and the *rasarūpasparśajñāna* they have here are used in fact in the sense of the

unconvincing while those which I adduced in 1990 still seem to me to be valid and could now, I believe, be supplemented with still others that point in the same direction, though I reserve a fresh discussion for another occasion. Let me just say that, considering all the recensions now available and their readings, it is not even the case that the reading *guṇakarmasu sannikṛṣṭeṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca*, which Nozawa prefers, is as he claims 'the majority reading' (1993b, 1155(8)).

100 Thus correctly Jambūvijaya, followed by Nozawa. Thakur did not print this as a sūtra.

101 Accepting the reading and division proposed by Jambūvijaya and Nozawa.

102 Śaṃkara Miśra also has *gandhajñāne* in that sūtra, 8.2.5 in his *sūtrapāṭha*, and he too explains the word as *gandho jñāyate 'neneti gandhajñānaṃ ghrāṇam* (371.3).

corresponding sense-organ.[103]

49. 9.5. *yac cānyat satas tad asat.* C and BhV *yac cānyat satas tad apy asat*, ŚM *yac cānyad asad atas tad asat.*[104] Not much weight can be attached to this case, as the reading given for A here is little more than a guess; the manuscript is hopelessly corrupt at this point.

- Sūtras in which A agrees with C against BhV and ŚM.

1. 2.1.6 *sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānāṃ pārthivānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam.* Both BhV and ŚM omit *pārthivānāṃ* and have *dravatvam adbhiḥ* for *dravatādbhiḥ*. In the case of the first difference, one could say that C and A are needlessly explicit, but it must be taken into account that in the following sūtra, which is closely parallel, all versions transmit a *taijasānām* corresponding to the *pārthivānāṃ* here; one could argue for the priority of either reading.
2. 2.2.20 *dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭam.* BhV adds *ca* while ŚM does not have the sūtra.
3. 2.2.26 *tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu ca viśeṣasyobhayathādṛṣṭatvāt.* BhV[105] and ŚM omit the *ca* (as does T).
4. 2.2.28 *acākṣuṣatvān na karma.* BhV reads *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya śabdo na karma* (2.2.24 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, 2.2.29 in his edition of the long version), and ŚM *nāpi karmācākṣuṣatvāt.*
5. 3.1.10 *saṃyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abhūtasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasya.* Aside from the question of whether or not this should be divided into a number of sūtras,[106]

103 Cf. Candrānanda ad 8.16 *gandhajñānaṃ ghrāṇam:* (64.24), and ad 8.17 *yato rasananayanasparśanāni rasarūpasparśān abhivyañjanty ataḥ...* (65.7); Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra ad 8.2.3 glossing *gandhajñāne* with *gandhajñāpaghrāṇe*.

104 Contrary to what is reported in Thakur 1965, and in consequence also by Nozawa, the Sena Court commentary does not agree with ŚM on this, but has *yac cānyad asatas tad asat*, as (subsequently) edited by Thakur (326.6). The commentary clearly supports this apparently paradoxical reading: see *tasmād uktarūpād abhāvatrayād yac cā[nya]: tad* (thus Thakur; better to emend *yac cānyad*, assuming an error of *tta* for *nya*) *abhāvarūpaṃ tad asad atyantābhāva ity arthaḥ* (326.7).

105 The sūtra is not to be found in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, but is in the long version, numbered 2.2.27 (TS 247.1).

106 This in itself can not be reckoned as a difference, as it is possible but at present impossible to prove that our hypothetical commentator also made such a division. In BhV, I follow Jambūvijaya in taking as a single sūtra, seeing no justification in the commentary for the division introduced by Thakur (probably under influence of ŚM) and followed by Nozawa

the differences here lie in the concluding part. For *bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abh¯tasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasya* BhV has *bhūtam abhūtasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasyābhūtaṃ bhūtasya*; merely a different word-order. ŚM omits *kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya* and *abhūtaṃ bhūtasya* (perhaps due to eyeskip), and has an anomalous masculine *bhūto* for the last *bhūtaṃ*.

6. 4.1.4 *anityam iti ca viśeṣapratiṣedhabhāvaḥ*. BhV omits the sūtra, while ŚM reads *anitya iti viśeṣataḥ pratiṣedhabhāvaḥ*.

7. 4.2.1 *pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate*. BhV reads *pratyakṣāpratyakṣavṛtter apratyakṣatvād vāyuvanaspatisaṃyogavat pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate* and ŚM *pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇāṃ saṃyogasyāpratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate*.

8. 5.1.2 *tathā musulakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca*. BhV omits, if the transmission is to be trusted here, and ŚM has *tathā hastasaṃyogāc ca musale karma*.

9. 5.2.8 *apāṃ saṃghāto vilayanaṃ ca tejasaḥ saṃyogāt*. BhV appears not to have this sūtra; ŚM reads *tejaḥsaṃyogāt* for *tejasaḥ saṃyogāt*.

10. 5.2.17 *kāyakarmaṇātmakarma vyākhyātam*. BhV reads *kāyakarmaṇātmakarmadharmayor anupapattiḥ*; ŚM omits.

11. 5.2.24 *niḥkriyāṇāṃ samavāyaḥ karmabhyaḥ pratiṣiddhaḥ*. BhV reads *karmabhiḥ* for *karmabhyaḥ* and ŚM has *niṣiddhaḥ* for *pratiṣiddhaḥ*.

12. 6.1.15 *etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyaḥ parādānaṃ vyākhyātam*. ŚM has *parasvādānaṃ* for *parādānaṃ*; the sūtra was apparently not known to BhV (cf. footnote 34 on p. 88 above).

13. 6.2.10 *ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt*. BhV omits *yamābhāvāt*. ŚM reads this as one sūtra together with the following, and has *niyamābhāvād* instead of *yamābhāvāt*.

14. 6.2.15 *tṛpteḥ*. BhV has *na tṛpteḥ* and ŚM has no equivalent.

15. 6.2.17 *icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ*. BhV omits the sūtra, and ŚM reads a compound *dharmādharmapravṛttiḥ* for *dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ*.

16. 7.1.3 *pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ*. BhV omits *dravyānityatvād* and reads *anityā eva* for *anityāḥ*. ŚM reads *pṛthivyādirūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāś ca*.

17. 7.1.7 *etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam*. BhV adds *apy* after *nityeṣv* while ŚM has *nityeṣu nityatvam* for *nityeṣv anityatvam*. The reading of A and

C is most likely to be original; ŚM may be considered to have polished away the apparent contradiction (showing a radical misunderstanding of the sūtra), while the particle in BhV has the function of drawing attention to the same paradox (and thereby safeguarding it from the same fate of 'correction').

18. 7.1.10 *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajāś ca*. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra considers *pākajāś ca* to be a separate sūtra. Both BhV and ŚM read *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ* for *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ*; the latter further has *pākajāḥ* for *pākajāś ca*.
19. 7.1.11 *apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pākajā na vidyante*. Again BhV has *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ* for *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ*; ŚM omits the sūtra.
20. 7.1.26 *tad anitye*. BhV reads *etad anityam* and ŚM has two sūtras, the first running *anitye 'nityam* (7.1.18) and the second *nitye nityam* (7.1.19).
21. 7.2.10 *kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete*. BhV reads *kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete* and ŚM *kāryakāraṇayor ekatvaikapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvaikapṛthaktvaṃ na vidyate*.
22. 7.2.22 *śabdārthāv asambaddhau*. BhV and ŚM read *asambandhau* for *asambaddhau*.
23. 7.2.33 *iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ sa samavāyaḥ*. For *iheti* BhV and ŚM read *ihedam iti*, which, as being more explicit, is again perhaps more likely to be secondary.
24. 7.2.34 *dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratiṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ*. For *dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatva°* BhV has *dravyaguṇakarmatva°* and ŚM *dravyatvaguṇatva°*.

- Sūtras in which A agrees with BhV against C and ŚM.

1. 1.2.4 *bhāvaḥ*. C *bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva*, ŚM *bhāvo 'nuvṛtter eva hetutvāt sāmānyam eva*. The A/BhV reading is certainly the most cryptic, i.e. *lectio difficilior*. ŚM goes to the other extreme, being over-explicit; almost certainly under the influence of Praśastapāda (cf. *sā* [i.e. *sattā*] *cānuvṛtter eva hetutvāt sāmānyam eva* PDhS 11.13–14).
2. 2.2.12 *ita idam iti yatas tad diśāṃ liṅgam*. For *diśāṃ* C has *diśo* and ŚM *diśyaṃ*.
3. 2.2.36 *saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ*. C has *śabdaniṣpatteḥ* for *śabdaniṣpattiḥ*; ŚM has *ca śabdāc* for *chabdāc*.

4. 5.2.12 *pṛthivīkarmaṇā tejasaḥ karma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam*. C and ŚM read *tejaḥkarma* for *tejasaḥ karma*, thus being more closely parallel to the *vāyukarma* which all versions seem to have.
5. 5.2.13 *agner ūrdhvajvalanaṃ vāyos tiryak pavanam aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmety adṛṣṭakāritāni*. C reads *vāyoś ca* for *vāyos* and ŚM has *aṇūnāṃ manasaś cādyaṃ karmādṛṣṭakāritam* for *aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmety adṛṣṭakāritāni*.
6. 5.2.19 *tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣaḥ*. C has *'prādurbhāvaḥ* for *'prādurbhāvaś ca*, and ŚM omits *sa*.
7. 6.2.8 *aśuci śucipratiṣedhaḥ*. The manuscript has only *śucipratiṣedhaḥ*; if I am correct in supplying only *aśuci* the text agrees with BhV alone, as C and ŚM have *aśucīti*. The omission in the manuscript is slightly more easy to explain—as a haplographical instance of eyeskip—if this is this case. The previous sūtra, defining *śuci*, lacks an *iti* in all versions, and I am inclined to think that the reading without the particle is likely to be original here too.
8. 7.2.9 *ekasyābhāvād bhāktaṃ na vidyate*. C *ekatvasyābhāvād bhāktaṃ na vidyate*, ŚM *ekatvābhāvād bhaktis tu vidyate*.
9. 7.2.27 *sāmayikaḥ śabdārthapratyayaḥ*. For *śabdārthapratyayaḥ* C and ŚM have *śabdād arthapratyayaḥ*.
10. 8.1.13 *ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣam*. For *tvayā* C reads *kṛtaṃ tvayā* and ŚM *tvayā kṛtam*.

- Sūtras in which A agrees with ŚM against C and BhV.

    1. 2.1.13 *adravyatvena nityatvam uktam*. C *adravyavattvena nityatvam uktam*, BhV *adravyavattvenānityatvam uktam*.[107] Cf. the remarks on 1.2.9 on p. 243 above.
    2. 3.2.5 *prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni*. C differs only in having *cety ātmaliṅgāni* for *cātmano liṅgāni*, but BhV is apparently

107 Thus as printed by Thakur in his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. In his edition of the long version, the sūtra is given as *adravyavattvena nityatvam uktam*, i.e. reading as C. The commentary however seems to me to support the anomalous reading with the negative: it begins, in the long version, *adravyavattvam āśrayadravyarahitatvam adravyatvam gaganādīnāṃ nityatvasādhakam| tac cātra nāstīti nāsya nityatvam*. It may be noted, by the way, that this bit of commentary does not rule out the possibility that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is explaining a reading *adravyatvenānityatvam uktam* instead of *adravyavattvenānityatvam uktam*.

quite different, having in place of *sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni* only *parātmani*[108] *liṅgam*.

3. 7.1.14 *ekadravyatvāt*. C reads *ekadravyavattvāt* and BhV *ekadravyatvāc ca*. Cf. the remarks on 1.2.9, p. 243 above.
4. 9.3 *asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram*. For *asataḥ* C has *asataḥ sat* and BhV *asati*. The Sena Court commentary apparently reads as do A and ŚM.

3.2.6 Evaluation

It would obviously be possible to go into much more detail in classifying and listing variants than I have done above; with four recensions to consider there are no less than 51 categories of variant possible. Such an analysis might have its uses if it were my intention to try and establish a stemma of recensions: here, however, my concern is simply to determine with some degree of exactness how A relates to the three commentary-versions. On this, the evidence presented in some detail above is sufficient to point fairly strongly to certain conclusions which can be summarized briefly.

First of all, in the light of what we have seen above, it is hardly necessary to argue further for the fact that A must be regarded as representing a recension distinct from C, BhV and ŚM. It also seems to me to be evident that A cannot have descended from any of these three, even allowing for the possibility of contamination on a fairly large scale. Note that none of the unique inclusions or readings of A betray a relationship with any of the commentaries we know.

This granted, it follows automatically, I think, that in any investigation of the philological problems of the sūtras it will be necessary to take A's testimony into consideration. Until a further representative of the A recension comes to light—the happiest chance would of course be if a manuscript containing also the hypothetical commentary were to be discovered—we are however hampered by the uncertainty attendant on the availability of but a sole source.

It also can be determined that among the versions, A is clearly closest to C. Even making allowance for a fairly large margin of error, due to the uncertainties in restoring A and the dubious text-quality of BhV, the difference between the number of A-C agreements and of A-BhV and A-ŚM agreements cannot but be regarded as significant. It is these two recensions, moreover, which have the smallest number of unique inclusions and omissions.

108 It is no doubt necessary adopt this (silent) emendation of Thakur; the manuscript has *paramātmani*.

On the whole, the text-quality of A seems to me to be surprisingly high. The fact that it agrees closely to C, more closely than BhV does, already suggests this, and I should say that A is definitely 'better' than both BhV (as transmitted at least) and ŚM. Above some instances were pointed out in which an unique reading in A could be older than the corresponding readings of the commentators. There are also not a few where a reading shared by A and only one of the other recensions is quite likely to be 'original.' Interpolations seem to be rare, especially by comparison with ŚM. In view of A's presumed independence, its support, especially when the three commentary-versions all differ, should be given considerable weight.

Obviously more work is necessary, but the best way forward now is probably with a detailed philological consideration of individual sūtras and groups of sūtras, attempting to reconstruct their textual history, taking into consideration all evidence, including that of secondary testimony and so on. Such investigations fall outside the scope of this work; though some remarks have been made in the previous section, these were of a scattered, unsystematical and incomplete nature—at best 'Anregungen' for the studies that remain to be done.

3.3 The Trivandrum MS

3.3.1 Description of the manuscript

The other manuscript of the VS *sūtrapāṭha* which, as I shall argue, is also a representative of an independent recension, is a palm-leaf manuscript in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum.[1] According to notes I took during a brief visit to this library in 1991, the manuscript number is 22615B, although the photocopy kindly supplied to me has the number 921B written (erroneously?) on it. It appears to be uncatalogued as yet; it is not listed in the *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. Vol. III (Ya to Sa)* (Bhaskaran 1984).

In the case of this manuscript too, a full description can not be attempted here: the remarks made are on the basis of photocopies of a portion of the manuscript. As in the case of the Ahmedabad manuscript, the text of the VS is preceded by that of the *Nyāyasūtra* without a commentary. The folios containing the VS *sūtrapāṭha* are numbered 20–34; one further leaf follows this, which is physically exactly similar to the preceding ones but is written in two hands, neither the same as that of the first 34 folios.

The leaves measure approximately 4.0 × 18.0 cm. There are 9 lines written one each side; the area written on measures on average about 3.0 × 15.0 cm. The leaves are pierced with two round holes, with a diameter of approximately 0.65 cm. The holes are symmetrically positioned, being both approximately 4.8 cm from the edge of the leaves and 1.65 cm from the top and bottom.[2] What is clearly unsymmetrical, however, is the amount of free space left around the two holes. The left hole is surrounded by a rectangular free area with a vertical dimension varying between approximately 1.8 and 2.2 cm and a horizontal dimension varying between approximately 2.9 and 3.5 cm. The right hole is also the centre of a free area, which is generally rectangular but sometimes roughly circular; the vertical dimension varies between approximately 1.2 and 1.5 cm and the horizontal between approximately 1.5 amd 1.9 cm. The difference in height between the two free areas arises from the fact that for the left one the scribe interrupts five lines, lines 3–7,[3] and for the right one only three, lines 4–6. As is customary with palm-leaf manuscripts, Northern and Southern, there are no lines defining the margin.

The manuscript is in an excellent state of preservation, and shows virtually no signs of use; thus the holes show very little wear from the string with which the

1 The first account of this manuscript was given in section III of Isaacson 1995, that report is to be regarded as superceded by the present description and edition.

2 Measuring from the closest point on the circumference.

3 Only on one of the sides available to me, f. 29r, are lines 2–7 interrupted

manuscript is tied, and there are no marginal jottings of readers.

3.3.2 The script and the scribe

The manuscript is written in clear and neat Malayalam script. Palaeography does not allow a certain dating, but I doubt that it can have been written earlier than the nineteenth century. As punctuation, we find both dots and short *daṇḍa*s; the difference between these categories is a gradual one.

The folios are numbered in the left margins of the recto sides with letter-numerals following the *nannādi* system. In colophons the scribe usually employs a sign which I take to be a stylized form of *śrī*, which has been represented as (śrī) in the diplomatic transcription.[4]

After the final colophon of the VS, there is a verse in Upendravajrā metre which appears to be scribal. Correcting the text slightly,[5] it reads as follows.

> *padārthaṣaṭkapratipādanāya kaṇādamiśrai racitaṃ yathāvat* |
> *alekhi vaiśeṣikasūtram etat trinetranāmnā dharaṇīsureṇa* ||

The scribe's name thus appears to be Trinetra; exactly what is meant to be conveyed by the epithet *dharaṇīsura* I am not certain.[6] The reference to the author of the VS as Kaṇādamiśra is consistent with the usage in the colophons of the manuscript.

If the verse was indeed written by the scribe of this manuscript, and not copied from the exemplar (a possibility which perhaps cannot be excluded), it seems that he was a man with some learning. The mistakes made in copying suggest however that the Vaiśeṣika may not have been a field with which he was particularly familiar—as would indeed probably be quite exceptional in the period in which the manuscript was copied—and give an impression of carelessness and perhaps haste, though the writing itself does not show many signs of this.

3.3.2.1 Scribal errors and corrections

Unfortunately, the number of scribal errors in this manuscript is large; markedly more so than in the Ahmedabad manuscript. A few examples of the main categories.

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). There are numerous cases of this, including some where entire sūtras can be presumed to

4 Cf. Burnell 1878, 82 and p. 44 above.
5 The diplomatic transcription may be found on p. 269 below.
6 Should one perhaps emend to *dharaṇīśvareṇa*?

have been lost, such as 1.2.16 and 1.2.17 (eyeskip caused by the recurrence of the same sūtra as 1.2.15 and 1.2.17).

2. Haplography. Rare; as in the Ahmedabad manuscript I assume that *samavāyaḥ* at f. 31r7 is a scribal error for *sa samavāyaḥ* (7.2.33), and the eyeskip in *vidyātaś ca* for *vidyāvidyātaś ca* at f. 23v3–4 (2.2.23) may also be put in this category.

3. Dittography. Some occurrences both on word-level, e.g. *śabdāc śabdāc ca* for *chabdāc ca* at f. 24r (2.2.36), and on the level of *akṣaras*, e.g. *bhojanīyam imiti* for *bhojanīyam iti* at f. 31v7–8.

4. Metathesis. *spaśarś ca* for *sparśaś ca* at f. 22r7 (2.1.9) may be called a kind of metathesis.

5. Misreading of similar *akṣaras*. There are one or two interesting errors such as *adraṣṭakānitāni* for *adṛṣṭakāritāni* at f. 26v6. The *dra* for *dṛ* is of course a common mistake, especially in Southern manuscripts, but the confusion between *n* and *r* is one which seems to me to point to an ancestor written in some form of Devanāgarī script.[7] There are also instances of corrected errors which confirm this; thus at f. 26v4–5 it may be significant that the scribe first wrote a *ya*, then cancelled that and continued correctly with *pataṇam*; this suggests the possibility that the immediate ancestor of our manuscript was one in which *pa* and *ya* were difficult to tell apart, again pointing to Devanāgarī, or at least a Northern script. Similarity between *ta* and *na* in the exemplar may lie behind the *ete*⟨(*ta*)⟩*na* at f. 25v4 (4.1.10): another characteristic of Devanāgarī and similar Northern scripts. Note also *parimāṇarmmāṇavyavahārakāraṇaṃ* for *parimāṇaṃ mānavyavahārakāraṇam* at f. 29v3 (7.1.17); it is plausible that one of the factors in the corruption here was that an ancestor wrote *parimānam māna*° with a ligature *mm* as is quite common in Northern manuscripts. A scribe accustomed to Malayalam, in which this would always be written either with an anusvāra or with a *halanta m*, may have then assumed that the doubling was caused by a superscript *r*. The misreading of initial *a* as *sa* which may have caused the error *karmmaguṇā saguṇāḥ* for *karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ* at f. 29v2 (7.1.23) is also more likely to occur in certain Northern hands than in a Southern script.

There is thus some reason to think that the exemplar from which our manuscript was copied was written in Devanāgarī. It is true that there are occasional confusions between *akṣaras* which are similar in Malayalam script, as

7 Another error which may perhaps be partly due to the same misreading is [illegible] at f. 28r9, if the underlying reading is indeed *tathā viruddhānāṃ*, cf. footnote 55 on p. 2[illegible] below.

in *katas* for *tatas* at f. 29r3 (6.2.15), but these are less frequent and I think less significant. They may be caused by carelessness in writing rather than inaccuracy in reading.

6. Substitution of phonetically similar *akṣara*s. The confusion of *dra* and *dṛ* mentioned under the previous heading falls into this category.

There are also not a few cases where what can hardly but be a scribal omission cannot be put down to homoeoteleuton, homoeoarcton or haplography. A case in point is the omission of *āpo* in 2.1.2, at f. 22r2, or *dravyakarmasu* for *dravyaguṇakarmasu* at f. 21v3 (1.2.7). In general, we may say that the scribe was more than ordinarily careless; one has the impression that his mind wandered frequently from the text he was copying.

There are a number of corrections, which seem to have been made by the scribe himself during the process of copying. Cancelled *akṣara*s are usually marked as such by a small line above them; sometimes they have been scratched out. Additions are squeezed in between the lines, usually under the *akṣara* to which they belong; there are no marginal insertions or annotations.

3.3.2.2 Ambiguities of the script

Aside from typical ambiguities of Malayalam script, notably *p*/*v* and *halanta m*/*ṃ*, it should be noted that the difference between medial *i* and *ī* is particularly slight with this scribe, and that, as mentioned above, some punctuation marks are somewhere between a dot and a short *daṇḍa*. There is a certain similarity between the signs for *halanta t* and *halanta n*; the scribe himself seems to regularly confuse them.

3.3.3 Diplomatic transcription

It should be noted that vowel signs are often (partly) on a different line (i.e. the preceding or following one) from the consonant they belong to: in the case of medial *ā* this can be clearly enough represented in the transcription (e.g. k[2]ā), but with the medial *e* for example, which is written before the consonant sign, and with complex vowel signs such as medial *o*, I have drawn attention to the fact in a footnote.

[f. 20r7] athāto dharmmaṃ [8] vyāvyāsyāmaḥ yato bhyudayaniśreyasasiddhis sa dharmmaḥ tadvacanād āmnāyapramāṇyaṃ [9] sādhanāny asya dravyaguṇakarmmāṇi · pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyu+r ā+kāśaḥ kālo di[f. 20v]g ātmā mana iti nava dravyāṇi · rūpasa(ga)ndhasparśā(nna)[8]ṃkhyā parimāṇāni pṛthaktvasaṃ[2]yogavibhāgau[9] paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchātveṣaprayatnā(ntva)[10] gu[3]ṇāḥ utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuñcanaṃ prasāraṇam iti karmmāṇi · [4] sad anityan dravyavat kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad i[5]ti dravyaguṇakarmmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ | dravyāṇy api dravyāntaram āra[6]bhante guṇāś ca guṇāntaraṃ karmma karmmasāddhyan na vindyate | kā[7]ryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca ubhayathā guṇaḥ kāryaviro[8]dhi karmma kriyāvat guṇavat[11] samavāyikāraṇam itri[12] dravyalakṣaṇaṃ · dravyāśrayagu[9]ṇavāt saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇaṃ | eka[f. 21r]vyam aguṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇam iti karmma(la)[13]kṣaṇaṃ dravyaguṇaka[2]rmmaṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaṃ tathā guṇaḥ saṃyogavibhāganāṃ karmma · na dravyāṇ[3]āṃ vyatire⟨(n)⟩+k+āt guṇavaidharmmyān na karmmaṇā dravyāṇān dravyaṃ kāryaṃ [4] samānyaṃ dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyā · pṛthaktvāsaṃyogavibh[5]āgāś cāsamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ · kāryaṃ karmma na[14] vidyate saṃ[6]yogānān dravyaṃ rūpāṇāṃ rūpaṃ gurutva·prayatnasaṃyo[7]gānām utkṣepaṇaṃ · saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmmaṇāṃ kāraṇas[8]āmānyo vyakarmmaṇāṃ karmmākāraṇam uktaṃ (śrī) | iti śrīmatkaṇādamiśraviraci[9]te[15] vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamasyāddhyāyasya prathamam āhnikaṃ | (śrī) |

kāraṇābhāvāt [f. 21v] kāryābhāvaḥ na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa iti buddhya[2]pekṣā bhāvas sāmānyam eva dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmma-

8 It looks as though the scribe first wrote *ya*, then, without visibly cancelling that, wrote *nna* beneath and touching it. The latter *akṣara* is presumably a mistake of *ssa*, the confusion of *na* and *sa* being frequent and easy in Malayalam script.

9 Corrected from *vibhāgo*.

10 The *akṣara* is closest to an *ntva* though it does not look quite right for that either. Certainly it does not bear a close resemblance to the required *śca*.

11 Corrected from *guṇavāt*.

12 Possibly corrected to *iti*.

13 The *akṣara* has probably been corrected from *va* to *la*.

14 Corrected from *ṇa*.

15 The sign for medial *e* is on line 8.

tvañ ca sāmānyāni viśeṣā[3]ś ca · anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ · sad iti yato dravyakarmmasu sa [4] dravyaguṇakarmmabhyo rtthantaraṃ sāmānyaṃ ekāvyatvān na dravyaṃ [5] guṇakarmmasu cca bhāvān na karmma guṇaḥ · sāmānyaviśeṣā[6]bhāvena cca ekāvyatvena dravyatvam uktaṃ sāmānyavi[7]śe[16]ṣābhāvena ca guṇe bhāvāt guṇatvam uktaṃ samavāyavi[8]śe[17]ṣābhāvena ca dravyetvena pṛthivitvādayaḥ | sallimgādāviśeṣād vi[9]śeṣalimgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ (śrī) | iti śrīmatkaṇādamiśraviracite [f. 22r] vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamo ddhyāyas samāptaḥ | (śrī) |

rūparasasparśavatī pṛthivī [2] rūparasasparśavatyā dravyā snigdhāś ca tejo rūpasparśavaṃ · vāyu sparśavāt ta [3] ākāśe na vidyante · sarppirjjatumadhūcchiṣṭānām agnisaṃyogā[4]d dravyatātbhis sāmānyaṃ trapusīsaloharajatasuva[5]rṇṇanān taijasānām agnisaṃyogād dravyatātbhi[6]s sāmānyaṃ viṣāṇī kakutmāt prāntebāladhis sāsnādi[7]mān iti (g)o[18]tve (dṛ)ṣṭaṃ liṃgaṃ · spaśarś ca · na ca draṣṭānāṃ sparśa i[8]ty adṛṣṭaliṃgo vāyuḥ (·) adravyatvā dravyaṃ kriyāvatvāt guṇavatvāc ca | adravya[9]tve nityatvam uktaṃ · vāyor vāyusamūhanan nānatve liṃgaṃ · vāyur iti sanni[f. 22v]karṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṃgan na vidyate · sāmānyatodṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ ta[2]smād āgamikaṃ saṃjñākarmma tv asya viśiṣṭānāṃ liṃgaṃ | pratyakṣāpūrvakatā saṃjñ[3]ākarmmaṇaḥ niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya ⟨ni⟩+li+ṃgaṃ · tad aliṃga[4]m e[19]katvāt karmmaṇaḥ kāraṇāntarāsak(l)ptivaidhammyāc ca [5] saṃyogābhāvād abhāva ka⟨ṇṇa⟩ṇaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrva[6]kaḥ kāryaguṇo dṛṣṭaḥ kāryāntaraprādu(r)bhāvāc ca · śabda spa[7]rśavatāṃ guṇaḥ[20] paratra samavā[8]yāt pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ guṇas sat liṃgam ākāśasya dra[9]vyatvanityatve vāyunā vyakhyāte tatvaṃ bhāvena · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣika[f. 23r]sūtre dvitīyasyāddhyāyasya pratha⟨ma⟩m āhnikaṃ · (śrī) ·

puṣpavastrayos sannikarṣe ga[2]⟨(r)ā⟩ndhāntarapradubhāvo vastre · gandhābhāvaliṃgaṃ · etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā [3] vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gandhaḥ apsu śītatā tejasy uṣṇatā aparasmi[4]t param aparaṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram iti kālaliṃg[5]āni dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte · tatvaṃ bhāve[6]na kāryiviśeṣe[21]ṇa nānātvaṃ aparasmin paraṃ yu[7]gapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣepram iti nityeṣv abhāvād ⟨(e)⟩anityeṣu ca bh[8]āvāt kālākhyā · ita idam iti yatas tad diśo liṃgaṃ dravyatvanityatve vāyunā [9] vyākhyāte · tatvaṃ bhāvena · kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvaṃ a⟨ti⟩+di+tyasaṃprayogāt [f. 23v] bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācīṃ tathā dakṣiṇā pratīcy udīcī ca · etena digantarāṇi [2] vyākhyātāni

16 The sign for medial *e* is on line 6.
17 The sign for medial *e* is on line 7.
18 Possibly corrected from *ho*.
19 The *pṛṣṭhamātra* medial *e* is on line 3.
20 After this a space large enough to have accommodated up to 13 *akṣaras* is left open, no doubt because there is a clearly visible flaw in the palm-leaf.
21 After this *akṣara* a small gap has been left open because of another flaw in the palm-leaf.

· sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca [3] saṃśayaḥ dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭan dṛṣṭañ ca dṛṣṭavat yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭa(ṣc)[22]ād vidyā[4]-taś ca saṃśayaḥ śrotragrahaṇo yo rthas sa śabdas tasmin [5] dravya–ṃ–guṇaḥ kammeti[23] saṃśayaḥ tulyajātīyeṣv artth[6]āntareṣu vicitraśeṣasyobhayathadṛṣṭatvād ataddravyatvā[7]n na dravyaṃ acakṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya guṇasya sato pasarggaḥ karmma[8]bhis sāddhyaṃ sato liṃgābhāvāt nityavaidhammyāt kāryatvāc ca śabdavya[9](ñja)kābhāvāt kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt doṣāt saṃyogavibh[f. 24r]āgāc śabdāc śabdāc ca śabdaniṣpatteḥ liṃgāc cānityaḥ ((dva))dvayoḥ pravṛtyo[24]r a[2]bhāvāt saṃkhyābhāvāc ca prathamaśabdāt saṃpratipattibhāvāc ca sandigddhā santi [3] bahutve saṃkhyābhāvas sāmānyataḥ prathamaśabdas saṃpratipatti[4]bhāvañ ca · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyo ddhyāyaḥ · [5] (śrī) ·

prasiddhā indriyārtthāḥ indriyārtthaprasiddhir indriyārtthe[6]bhyo[25] ntartthāntaratve hetuḥ so napadeśaḥ kāraṇā[7]jñānāt kāryajñānāt · ajñānāc ca · anya eva hetur ity a[8]napadeśa artthāntarasyānapadeśaḥ saṃyogasamavāyy ekārtthasamavāyy a[9]-virodhi ca kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya viroddhy a[f. 24v]bhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abhūtasya prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād apadeśasya [2] apraṇī tasmāt gaur iti ca tat karmmendriyamanortthasannikarṣān niṣpadyate [3] tad anyat pravṛttinivṛtti pratyagātmadṛṣṭe paratra liṃgaṃ · (śrī) · i[4]ti vaiśeṣikasūtre tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikaṃ · (śrī) ·

kā[5]mendriyārtthasannikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca [6] manaso liṃgaṃ · dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyā[7]te prayatnāyaugapadyāt jñānāyaugapadyāc caikaṃ prā[26]ṇā[8]pānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamatīndriyāntaravikārās sukhaduḥkhecchādve[27][9]ṣaprayatnāś cety ātmaliṃgāni · dravyanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte deva[f. 25r]datta iti sannikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvā dṛṣṭaṃ liṃgan na vidyate sāmānyato[28][2]draṣṭatvāś cāviśeṣaḥ tasmād āgamikaṃ · aham iti śabdavyatirekān nāg[3]āmikaṃ · yadi ca dṛṣṭapratyakṣo han devadatto yajñadatta iti de[29][4]vadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīty upacārāc śārī[5]rāpratyakṣaḥ (na tu) sandigddhas tūpacāraḥ aham iti pratyagā[6]tmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād artthāntarapratyakṣa ·

22 The scribe seems to have written a *ṣ* with a *c* below it and touching it. Perhaps the *ṣ* was meant to be cancelled.
23 After this a space large enough for up to 4 *akṣaras* was left open, because of another flaw in the palm-leaf.
24 Probably corrected from *tyā* by the cancellation of the first *t* and the addition of the *pṛṣṭhamātra* curve to change *ā* to *o*.
25 The *pṛṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 5.
26 Corrected from *pra* by the addition of the sign for medial *ā* beneath and to the right of the *akṣara*.
27 The scribe started to write something else, probably *tve*, and then corrected to *dve*.
28 The stroke of the medial *o* after the consonant sign is on line 2.
29 The medial *e* is on line 3.

na tu śa[7]rīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayo jñānaviśeṣaḥ sukha[8]duḥkhajñāna-niṣpatyaviśeṣād aikātmyaṃ · nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ ś[9]āstrasāmartthyāc ca · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣisūtre tṛtīyo ddhyāyas samāptaḥ · (śrī) |

[f. 25v] yad akāraṇavat ta(n) ni[30]tyaṃ tasya kāryaṃ liṃgaṃ kāraṇābhāvād dhi kāryābhāvaḥ [2] nityam iti ca viśeṣata[31]ḥ pratiṣedhābhāvaḥ avidyā ca · mahatv anekadravyatv[3]āt paramāṇvāv anupalabdhiḥ · anekadravyeṇa samavāyād rū[4]paviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ ete⟨(ta)⟩na rasagandhaspa[5]śe[32]ṣu jñānaṃ vyā[33]khyātam · tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ saṃkhy[6]āparimāṇāni pṛ⟨(ru)⟩thaktva-saṃyogavibhāgau para[7]tvāparatvaikatve ca rūpadravyasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi [8] arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt etena guṇatve bhāve[34] ca sarvendriyajñānaṃ [9] vyā[35]khyātaṃ · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣike caturtthasyāddhyāyasyā⟨(?)⟩[36]dyam āhnikaṃ | (śrī) |

[f. 26r] pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakan na vidya-[2]te[37] guṇāntaraprādubhbhāvāc ca tryātmakam api na · manaātmasaṃyogas tv avi-prati[3]ṣindho mithaḥ pañcānāṃ anekadeśapūrvakatvād dharmmaviśe[4]ṣāt samākhyābhāvāt santy ayonijāni vedaliṃg[5]āc ca | (śrī) | iti vaiśeṣikasūtre caturtthā-ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |

[6] ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karmma tathā musalaka[7]rmma hastasaṃyogāc ca · abhighātaje musalakarmmaṇi vyatirekā[8]d akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ · tathākṣasaṃyogo hastakarmmaṇi musalābhigh[9]ātāt tu musalasaṃyogān dhaste karmma kathātmakarmma hastasaṃyogāc ca · saṃ[f. 26v]yogabhāve na gurutvāt patanaṃ nodanaviśeṣabhāvān norddhvan na [2] tiryag gamanaṃ prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣā[38]ḥ nodanaviśeṣād uda[3]sanaviśeṣaḥ hastakarmmaṇā dārukarmma vyākhyātaṃ tathā dagddha[4]sya visphoṭanaṃ prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya ⟨(ya)⟩ [5] patanaṃ tṛṇakarmma vāyusaṃyogāt maṇigamanaṃ sūcya[6]bhisa-marppaṇam ity adraṣṭakānitāni iṣāv aryaṃgaṃ saṃ[7]yogaviśeṣāḥ karmmānyatve hetuḥ nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ [8] karmmakāritvāc ca saṃskārād uttaran tatho-ttaram uttañ ca saṃskārābhā[9]ve[39] gurutvāt patanaṃ | (śrī) | iti vaiśeṣikasūtre pañcamasyādyam āhnikaṃ [f. 27r] | (śrī) |

nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca pṛthivyāṃ kaṃ tad viśeṣa[2]ṇādṛṣṭakāritaṃ

30 The *akṣara* has perhaps been corrected from *ni* to *nni*.
31 The *akṣara* has probably been corrected from *da*.
32 The sign for medial *e* is on line 4.
33 The sign for medial *ā* has been added beneath and to the right of the *akṣara*.
34 The consonant sign has probably been corrected, but I am not sure from what.
35 The sign for medial *ā* has been added below and to the right of the consonant sign.
36 The cancelled *akṣara* probably a ligature.
37 The sign for medial *e* is on line 1.
38 The sign for medial *ā* has been added beneath and to the right of the consonant sign.
39 The sign for medial *e* is on line 8.

apāṃ saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanaṃ · dravyatvāt [3] syandanaṃ · nādyā vāyusaṃyogād āherāharaṇaṃ · nodanā[4]pīḍanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca vṛkṣābhisappaṇam i[5]ty adṛṣṭakāritaṃ apāṃ saṃghāto vilayanañ ca te[6]jassaṃyogāt tatra yasphūrjjathul(l)iṃgaṃ | vaidikaś ca | [7] apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca stanayittaḥ pṛthivīkarmmaṇā [8] tejaḥkarmmaṇā vāyukarmma ca vyākhyātaṃ agner ūrddhvajvalanaṃ vāyo[9]s tiryak panam aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmmety adṛṣṭakāritāni hastakarmmaṇā [f. 27v] ⟨(ya)⟩ manasaḥ karmma vyākhyātaṃ ātmendriyārtthasannikaṣāt sukhaduḥkhe | tadā[2]⟨?⟩rambha ātmaso manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvāt saṃyoga k[3]āyakarmmaṇātmakarmma vyākhyātaṃ apasappaṇam aśitapītasaṃ[4]yo[40]gāḥ kāyāntara⟨(na)⟩saṃyogāś cety adṛṣṭakāri[5]tāni · tadabhāve saṃyogabhāvo prādurbhāvaś ca [6] mo[41]kṣaḥ dravyaguṇakarmmaniṣpattivaidhammyāt bhāvas tamaḥ | [7] tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca · dirkkālāv ākāśaś ca [8] kriyāvatbhyo vaidharmmyān niṣkriyāṇi · etena karmmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyā[9]tāḥ niṣkriyāṇāṃ samavāyaḥ karmmaṇy apratiṣiddhaḥ | kāraṇatvāt[42] samavāyi[f. 28r]no guṇāḥ guṇair ddig vyākhyātā kāraṇena kālaḥ (śrī) iti vaiśeṣi[2]kasūtre pañcamo ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |

buddhipūrvavākyakṛtir vede na cāsmāt bu[3]ddhibhyo liṃgam ṛ⟨kṣa⟩ṣeḥ tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarmma siddhi[4]l(l)iṃgaṃ buddhipūrvo dadāti mahīne cāpravṛttiḥ ta[5]thā pratigrahaḥ tayos tu kramo yathā itaretarāṃ[6]gabhūtānāṃ (·) ātmaguṇesv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāra[7]ṇatvāt ⟨?⟩[43] amṛṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato bhyudada[8]yas tad amṛṣṭabhojane na vidyate | viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ same hīne cāpravṛ[9]ttiḥ etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmmikebhyas tada⟨śa⟩nuvidhānāñ ca tyāgaḥ · [f. 28v] sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ · (śrī) | iti vai[2]śeṣikasūtre ṣaṣṭhasyāddhyāyasyādyam āhnikaṃ | (śrī) |

daṣānān dṛṣṭaprayoja[3]nānām adṛṣṭābhāve prayogo bhyudayāya · abhiṣecano[4]pavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthayajña⟨?⟩[5]dānaprokṣaṇadinakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭ[6]āya · cāturāśramyam upadhā ca · bhāvadoṣa upadh[7]ā | adoṣo nupadhā iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ prokṣi[8]tañ ca śuci aśuciti śucipratiṣedhaḥ artthānāñ ca ayatasya śuci[9]bhojanābhyudayo na vidyate · yamābhāvād vidyate cānartthātara[f. 29r]tvād yamasya na vyāsaṃgabhojanavad abhisandhiśuddhyabhāvāt icchādveṣa[2]pūrvikā dharmmādharmmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ katas saṃyogo vibhā⟨ga⟩[3]gañ ca karmmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ · (śrī) iti vaiśeṣikasū[4]tre[44] ṣaṣṭho ddhyāyaḥ (śrī) |

40 The *pṛṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 3.
41 The *pṛṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 5.
42 The sign for medial *ā* and the *t* may both have been cancelled, though the 'cancellation marks' could also be small flaws in the palm-leaf.
43 The cancelled character may be the beginning of initial *a*.
44 The sign for medial *e* is on line 3.

uktā guṇāḥ guṇalakṣañ coktaṃ [5] i⟨ta⟩dam evaṃguṇam iti coktaṃ pṛthavyāṃ rūparasagandha[6]sparśadravyānityatvād anityāḥ agnisaṃyogac ca guṇā[7]ntaraprādurbhāvāt etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktaṃ · a⟨(spa)⟩[8]psu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyanityatvāt anityeṣv anityā dravyā[9]nityatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyā⟨h⟩+ṃ+ pākajāś ca apsu tejasi [f. 29v] vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pāka⟨(jña)⟩+jā+ na vidyate aguṇavato dravya[2]sya guṇāntarārambhāt karmmaguṇā aguṇāḥ etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ sva[3]bhāvavirodhāt parimāṇarmmāṇavyavahārakāraṇaṃ a[4]ṇo[45]r mmahāntaś ca (·) upalabdhyanupalabdhi nitye vyākhyā[5]te · kāraṇamahatvāt bahutvāt kāraṇamahatv[6]āt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat · tadviparītam aṇu a[7]ṇu mahad iti tasmin viśeṣābhāvāc ca ekakālatā dṛṣṭ[8]āntāc ca · aṇutvamahatvayor aṇutvamahatvābhāvaḥ karmmaguṇair vyākhyātaḥ · [9] aṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ karmmaguṇāt saguṇāḥ etena dīrghatvahrasvatve vy[f. 30r]ākhyāte · karmabhiḥ karmmāṇi guṇe gguṇaiḥ tad anityeṣv anityan nityaṃ parima[2]ṇḍalaṃ avidyā vidyāliṃgaṃ vibhavān mahān ākāśaḥ · tathā cātmā · tadabhāvā[3]d aṇu manaḥ guṇair ddik vyākhyātā · kāraṇena kālaḥ · (śrī) | iti [4] vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamasyāddhyāyasyādyam āhni[5]kaṃ · (śrī) ·

rūparasagandhasparśavyatire⟨ka⟩kād artthānta[6]ram ekatvaṃ tathā pṛthaktva[46]ṃ | tayo nnityānitya[7]tve[47] tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte | karmmabhiḥ karmmāṇi | [8] guṇe gguṇāḥ ssaṃkhyatvāt karmmaṇāṃ sarvaikatvan na vidyate kāryakāraṇa[9]yor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete · etad ani[f. 30v]tyayo vyākhyātaṃ | anyatarakarmmaja ubhayasaṃyogajaḥ karmmajaś ca saṃyo[2]gaḥ etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ | saṃyogavibhāgayos saṃyogavi[3]bhāvo ṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ karmmabhiḥ karmmāṇi | gu[4]ṇai[48]gguṇāḥ yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayos saṃ[5]yogavibhāgā na vidyante · guṇatvāt guṇe ca [6] bhāṣyate · ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvād atī[7]tānāgatapratyayābhāvāt prasaṃgāt asti ⟨t⟩nāstīti pra[8]yogāt śabdārthav asaṃbandhau saṃyogino daṇḍāt samavāyi[9]no viṣāṇāc cādṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ anavamiṣṭagrahaṇāc ca [f. 31r] tathāpratyayābhāvaḥ saṃbandhasaṃbandhād iti cet sandehaḥ akṛts(n)ak[2]āritvāt sāmayikaś śabdād artthapratyayaḥ ekadikkālābhyāṃ sannikṛṣṭavi[3]prakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param apadaṃ kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇāpara[4]tvāc ca paratvāparatve paratvāparatvayoḥ pa[5]ratvāparatvābhāvo ṇutvamahatvābhyāṃ vyākhyā[6]taḥ · karmmabhiḥ karmmāṇi · guṇai gguṇāḥ · iheti yataḥ [7] kāryakāraṇayos samavāyaḥ dravyatvaguṇatvakarmmatvaprati[8]ṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ | tatvaṃ bhāvena · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣikasūtre [9] saptamo ddhyāyaḥ · (śrī) |

45 The *pṛṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 3.
46 Corrected from *tva* by squeezing a *k* in.
47 The sign for medial *e* is on line 6.
48 The sign for medial *ai* is on line 3.

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātaṃ · mana ātmā ca jñānani[f. 31v]rddai[49]śo jñānaniṣpattir uktā | guṇakarmmasv asannikṛṣṭeṣu jñānaniṣpatte dra[2]vyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇākāraṇañ ca sāmānyaviśeṣu ⟨dha⟩ sāmānyaviśeṣā[3]bhāvāt ta·ta eva jñānaṃ samānyaviśeṣāpekṣan dravyagu[4]ṇakarmmasu dravye dravyaguṇāpekṣaṃ guṇakarmmasu guṇa[5]karmmābhāvāṯ guṇakarmmāpekṣan na vidyate · samavāyi[6]śvaityā śvaityabuddhe śvete buddhis te kārya[7]kāraṇabhūte dravyeṣv anitaviśeṣāṯ ayam eṣa tvayā bho[50][8]janīyam imiti buddhyapekṣa dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣv abhāvād arttha iti dravya[9]guṇakarmmasu dravyeṣu pañcātmakaṃ pratyuktaṃ bhūyastvāc ca pṛthivī gandhajñā[f. 32r]ne tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāṯ | (śrī) | [2] iti vaiśeṣikasūtre aṣṭamo ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvāṯ a[3]saṯ · sad asatas saṯ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād artthāntaraṃ sac ca [4] sad yac cānyaṯ satas tad asaṯ asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvā[5]ṯ smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca · etenāghaṭo gau[6]r adharmmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ abhūtan nātīta ity anartthāntaraṃ nā[7]sti ghaṭo neha iti sato ghaṭasya nehasaṃyogapratiṣe[8]dhaḥ nāsty anyaś candramā iti sāmānyāc candramasi pratiṣedhaḥ sad asarvaidharmmyāṯ k[9]ārye sadasattā na⟨ṃ⟩+·+ ātmany ātmamanasos saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣaṃ · [f. 32v] tathā dravyāntareṣu · ātmendriyamanortthasannikarṣāc ca taṯsamavāyāṯ [2] karmmaguṇeṣu ātmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu · asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ saṃ[3]bandhy ekārtthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṃgikaṃ ete[4]na śābdaṃ vyākhyātaṃ hetur upadeśa liṃgan nimittaṃ [5] pramāṇam ity anartthāntaraṃ asyedam iti buddhyapekṣa[6]tvāṯ ātmamanasos saṃyogaviśeṣāṯ skār[7]āc ca smṛtiḥ tathā svapnāntikan dharmmyāś (c)a · indriyā⟨ṯ⟩doṣā[8]ṯ saṃskārāc cāmitthyā tad aduṣṭaṃ jñānam aduṣṭaṃ etat siddhadarśana[9]ñ ca dharmmebhyaḥ (śrī) | iti vaiśeṣikasūtre navamo ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |

ātmasa[f. 33r]mavāyas sukhaduḥkhayoḥ pañcabho rtthāntaratve hetuḥ tadātrayibhyaś ca guṇe[2]bhyaḥ iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇaviśeṣāvirodhāc ca mithas sukhaduḥkhayor artthāntarabh[3]āvaḥ saṃśayanirṃṇayāntābhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ tayo[4]r nniṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṃgikābhyāṃ vyākhyātā bhūtam iti pratya[5]kṣaṃ vyākhyātaṃ | bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare draṣṭatvāṯ tathā [6] bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo nirapekṣebhyaś ca | abhūd ity a[7]bhūtatvāṯ sati ca kāryāsamavāyāṯ ekārtthasamavāyiṣu kā[8]raṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa ity ekasmiṯ śiraḥ pṛṣṭaṃ pāṇir iti tadvi[9]śeṣebhyaḥ kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāṯ saṃyogād vā kāraṇasama[f. 33v]vāyāṯ karmma tathā rūpe kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca | kāraṇasamavāy[2]āṯ saṃyoge kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca | saṃyuktasamavāyād agne [3] vai[51]śeṣikaṃ laiṃgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyātaṃ dṛṣṭānān dṛ[4]ṣṭaprayojanānān dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo bhyudayāya | [5] tadvavacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyaṃ | (śrī) iti śrīmaṯkaṇā-

49 The first stroke of the sign for medial *ai* is on f. 31r9.

50 The stroke of the medial *o* after the consonant sign is on line 8.

51 The first stroke of the sign for medial *ai* is on line 2.

dami[6]śraviracitavaiśeṣikasūtre da⟨(śa)⟩śamo⟨d(dh)ya⟩ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |
[7] vaiśeṣikasūtraṃ samāptaṃ | (śrī) | padārthaṣaṭkapratipādanā[8]ya kaṇādamiśrai racitaṃ yathāvaṭ alekhi vaiśeṣikasūtram eta kritri[9]netranāmnā dharaṇīsureṇa | (śrī) | śubham astu | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) |

3.3.4 Reconstruction of the *sūtrapāṭha*

Reading through the diplomatic transcription given immediately above, it will have become clear that the text of this manuscript is plagued by scribal errors to such an extent that reconstruction of the hyparchetype is far more uncertain a business than it was with the Ahmedabad manuscript. Omissions, which can usually be put down to eyeskip, are quite frequent, as the number of words and even entire sūtras placed in square brackets below indicates. I have found it particularly difficult to decide to what extent sūtras omitted can be safely supposed to have been present in the hyparchetype. In general, if a sūtra is testified to unanimously by all other versions and if there is further a plausible mechanical cause for its omission, I have supplied it—though if there is more than one reading known elsewhere it is a further difficulty to decide what form it is most likely to have taken in T.

athāto dharmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ || 1.1.1 ||
yato 'bhyudayaniḥśreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmaḥ || 1.1.2 ||
tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 1.1.3 ||
sādhanāny asya dravyaguṇakarmāṇi || 1.1.4 ||
pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaḥ kālo dig ātmā mana iti nava dravyāṇi || 1.1.5 ||
rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyā parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś ca guṇāḥ || 1.1.6 ||
utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuñcanaṃ prasāraṇam iti karmāṇi || 1.1.7 ||
sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ || 1.1.8 ||
dravyāṇy api dravyāntaram ārabhante || 1.1.9 ||
guṇāś ca guṇāntaram || 1.1.10 ||
karma karmasādhyaṃ na vidyate || 1.1.11 ||
kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca || 1.1.12 ||
ubhayathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.13 ||
kāryavirodhi karma || 1.1.14 ||
kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇam iti dravyalakṣaṇam || 1.1.15 ||
dravyāśrayy aguṇavān saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇam || 1.1.16 ||
ekadravyam aguṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇam iti karmalakṣaṇam || 1.1.17 ||
dravyaguṇakarmaṇām dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyam || 1.1.18 ||
tathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.19 ||
saṃyogavibhāgānāṃ karma || 1.1.20 ||
na dravyāṇāṃ vyatirekāt || 1.1.21 ||

guṇavaidharmyān na karmaṇām || 1.1.22 ||
dravyāṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam || 1.1.23 ||
dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca || 1.1.24 ||
asamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ kāryaṃ karma na vidyate || 1.1.25 ||
saṃyogānāṃ dravyam || 1.1.26 ||
rūpāṇāṃ rūpam || 1.1.27 ||
gurutvaprayatnasaṃyogānām utkṣepaṇam || 1.1.28 ||
saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmaṇām || 1.1.29 ||
kāraṇasāmānye dravyakarmaṇāṃ karmākāraṇam uktam || 1.1.30 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamasyādhyāyasya prathamam āhnikam ||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvaḥ || 1.2.1 ||
na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ || 1.2.2 ||
sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam || 1.2.3 ||
bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva || 1.2.4 ||
dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmatvaṃ ca sāmānyāni viśeṣāś ca || 1.2.5 ||
anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ || 1.2.6 ||
sad iti yato dravya[guṇa]karmasu sā [sattā] || 1.2.7 ||
dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaraṃ sāmānyam || 1.2.8 ||
ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 1.2.9 ||
guṇakarmasu ca bhāvān na karma [na] guṇaḥ || 1.2.10 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.11 ||
ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam || 1.2.12 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.13 ||
guṇe bhāvād guṇatvam uktam || 1.2.14 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.15 ||
[karmaṇi bhāvāt karmatvam uktam] || 1.2.16 ||
[sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca] || 1.2.17 ||
dravyatvena pṛthivītvādayaḥ || 1.2.18 ||
salliṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ || 1.2.19 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||

rūparasasparśavatī pṛthivī || 2.1.1 ||
rūparasasparśavatya [āpo] dravāḥ snigdhāś ca || 2.1.2 ||
tejo rūpasparśavat || 2.1.3 ||
vāyuḥ sparśavān || 2.1.4 ||
ta ākāśe na vidyante || 2.1.5 ||
sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.6 ||

trapusīsaloharajatasuvarṇānāṃ taijasānām agnisaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.7 ||
viṣāṇī kakudmān prānteväladhiḥ sāsnādimān iti gotve dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgam 2.1.8 ||
sparśaś ca || 2.1.9 ||
na ca dṛṣṭānāṃ sparśa ity adṛṣṭaliṅgo vāyuḥ || 2.1.10 ||
adravyatvād dravyam || 2.1.11 ||
kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ca || 2.1.12 ||
adravyatvena nityatvam uktam || 2.1.13 ||
vāyor vāyusammūrcchanaṃ nānātve liṅgam || 2.1.14 ||
vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgaṃ na vidyate 2.1.15 ||
sāmānyatodṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 2.1.16 ||
tasmād āgamikam || 2.1.17 ||
saṃjñākarma tv asmadviśiṣṭānāṃ liṅgam || 2.1.18 ||
pratyakṣāpūrvakatvāt saṃjñākarmaṇaḥ || 2.1.19 ||
niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgam || 2.1.20 ||
tad aliṅgam ekadravyatvāt karmaṇaḥ || 2.1.21 ||
kāraṇāntarānuklptivaidharmyāc ca || 2.1.22 ||
saṃyogābhāvād abhāvaḥ karmaṇaḥ || 2.1.23 ||
kāraṇaguṇapūrvakaḥ kāryaguṇo dṛṣṭaḥ || 2.1.24 ||
kāryāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ || 2.1.25 ||
paratra samavāyāt pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ 2.1.26 ||
guṇaḥ saṃl liṅgam ākāśasya || 2.1.27 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.1.28 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.1.29 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyasyādhyāyasya prathamam āhnikam ||

puṣpavastrayoḥ saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre gandhābhāvaliṅgam || 2.2.1 ||
etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā || 2.2.2 ||
vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gandhaḥ || 2.2.3 ||
apsu śītatā || 2.2.4 ||
tejasy uṣṇatā || 2.2.5 ||
aparasmin paraṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram iti kālaliṅgāni[52] 2.2.6 ||

52 The partial repetition of this sūtra in the manuscript, a few lines later, I regard as an inadvertent scribal error.

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.7 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.8 ||
kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.9 ||
nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt || 2.2.10 ||
[kāraṇe] kālākhyā || 2.2.11 ||
ita idam iti yatas tad diśo liṅgam || 2.2.12 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.13 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.14 ||
kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.15 ||
ādityasamprayogād [bhūtapūrvād] bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācī || 2.2.16 ||
tathā dakṣiṇā pratīcy udīcī ca || 2.2.17 ||
etena digantarāṇi vyākhyātāni || 2.2.18 ||
sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.19 ||
dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭam || 2.2.20 ||
dṛṣṭaṃ ca dṛṣṭavat || 2.2.21 ||
yathādṛṣṭam ayathā[dṛṣṭam ubhayathā]dṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.22 ||
[vidyā]vidyātaś ca saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.23 ||
śrotragrahaṇo yo 'rthaḥ sa śabdaḥ || 2.2.24 ||
tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.25 ||
tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu viśeṣasyobhayathādṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.26 ||
ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 2.2.27 ||
acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya || 2.2.28 ||
guṇasya sato 'pavargaḥ karmabhiḥ sādharmyam || 2.2.29 ||
sato liṅgābhāvāt || 2.2.30 ||
nityavaidharmyāt || 2.2.31 ||
kāryatvāc ca || 2.2.32 ||
śabdavyañjakābhāvāt || 2.2.33 ||
kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt || 2.2.34 ||
doṣāt || 2.2.35 ||
saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpatteḥ || 2.2.36 ||
liṅgāc cānityaḥ || 2.2.37 ||
dvayoḥ pravṛttyor abhāvāt || 2.2.38 ||
saṃkhyābhāvāc ca || 2.2.39 ||
prathamāśabdāt || 2.2.40 ||
sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.41 ||
saṃdigdhāḥ sati bahutve || 2.2.42 ||
saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ || 2.2.43 ||
prathamāśabdaḥ || 2.2.44 ||

sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.45 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

prasiddhā indriyārthāḥ || 3.1.1 ||
indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntaratve hetuḥ || 3.1.2 ||
so 'napadeśaḥ || 3.1.3 ||
kāraṇājñānāt || 3.1.4 ||
kāryājñānāt || 3.1.5 ||
ajñānāc ca || 3.1.6 ||
anya eva hetur ity anapadeśaḥ || 3.1.7 ||
[arthāntaraṃ hy] arthāntarasyānapadeśaḥ || 3.1.8 ||
saṃyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ca kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abhūtasya [bhūtaṃ bhūtasya] || 3.1.9 ||
prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād apadeśasya || 3.1.10 ||
[viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo] viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti ca || 3.1.11 ||
ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣād [yan] niṣpadyate tad anyat || 3.1.12 ||
pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam || 3.1.13 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca manaso liṅgam 3.2.1 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.2 ||
prayatnāyaugapadyāj jñānāyaugapadyāc caikam || 3.2.3 ||
prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmaliṅgāni || 3.2.4 ||
dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.5 ||
devadatta iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgaṃ na vidyate 3.2.6 ||
sāmānyatodṛṣṭatvāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.7 ||
tasmād āgamikam || 3.2.8 ||
aham iti śabdavyatirekān nāgamikam || 3.2.9 ||
yadi ca dṛṣṭapratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto yajñadatta iti || 3.2.10 ||
devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīty upacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ 3.2.11 ||
saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ || 3.2.12 ||
aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāntarapratyakṣaḥ 3.2.13 ||
na tu śarīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñānaviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.14 ||
sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmyam || 3.2.15 ||

nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ || 3.2.16 ||
śāstrasāmarthyāc ca || 3.2.17 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||

yad akāraṇavat tan nityam || 4.1.1 ||
tasya kāryam liṅgam || 4.1.2 ||
kāraṇābhāvād dhi kāryābhāvaḥ || 4.1.3 ||
nityam iti ca viśeṣataḥ pratiṣedhābhāvaḥ || 4.1.4 ||
avidyā ca || 4.1.5 ||
mahaty anekadravyatvād [rūpāc copalabdhiḥ] || 4.1.6 ||
[adravyatvāt] paramāṇāv anupalabdhiḥ || 4.1.7 ||
[rūpasaṃskārābhāvād vāyāv anupalabdhiḥ] || 4.1.8 ||
anekadravyeṇa samavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ || 4.1.9 ||
etena rasagandhasparśeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.10 ||
tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ || 4.1.11 ||
saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve [karma] ca rūpidravyasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi || 4.1.12 ||
arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt || 4.1.13 ||
etena guṇatve bhāve ca sarvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.14 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre caturthasyādhyāyasyādyam āhnikam ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate || 4.2.1 ||
guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca tryātmakam api na || 4.2.2 ||
manaātmasaṃyogas tv avipratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām || 4.2.3 ||
anekadeśapūrvakatvāt || 4.2.4 ||
dharmaviśeṣāt || 4.2.5 ||
samākhyābhāvāt || 4.2.6 ||
[saṃjñādimattvāt] || 4.2.7 ||
santy ayonijāni || 4.2.8 ||
vedaliṅgāc ca || 4.2.9 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre caturthādhyāyaḥ ||

ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karma || 5.1.1 ||
tathā musalakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.2 ||
abhighātaje musulakarmaṇi vyatirekād akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ || 5.1.3 ||
tathātmasaṃyogo hastakarmaṇi || 5.1.4 ||
musulābhighātāt tu musulasaṃyogād dhaste karma || 5.1.5 ||
tathātmakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.6 ||

saṃyogabhāve na gurutvāt patanam[53] || 5.1.7 ||
nodanaviśeṣābhāvān nordhvaṃ na tiryag gamanam || 5.1.8 ||
prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.9 ||
nodanaviśeṣād udasanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.10 ||
hastakarmaṇā dārakakarma vyākhyātam || 5.1.11 ||
tathā dagdhasya visphoṭanam || 5.1.12 ||
prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanam || 5.1.13 ||
tṛṇakarma vāyusaṃyogāt || 5.1.14 ||
maṇigamanaṃ sūcyabhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.1.15 ||
iṣāv ayugapat saṃyogaviśeṣāḥ karmānyatve hetuḥ || 5.1.16 ||
nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma karmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaraṃ tathottaram uttaraṃ ca || 5.1.17 ||
saṃskārābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.18 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre pañcamasy[ādhyāyasy]ādyam āhnikam ||

nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca pṛthivyāṃ karma || 5.2.1 ||
tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.2 ||
apāṃ saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.2.3 ||
dravatvāt syandanam || 5.2.4 ||
nāḍyā vāyusaṃyogād āhārārohaṇam || 5.2.5 ||
nodanāt pīḍanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca || 5.2.6 ||
vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.7 ||
apāṃ saṃghāto vilayanaṃ ca tejaḥsaṃyogāt || 5.2.8 ||
tatrāvasphūrjathur liṅgam || 5.2.9 ||
vaidikaṃ ca || 5.2.10 ||
apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca stanayitnuḥ || 5.2.11 ||
pṛthivīkarmaṇā tejaḥkarma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam || 5.2.12 ||
agner ūrdhvajvalanaṃ vāyos tiryakpavanam aṇumanasoś cādyaṃ karmety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.13 ||
hastakarmaṇā manasaḥ karma vyākhyātam || 5.2.14 ||
ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe || 5.2.15 ||
tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvāt saṃyogaḥ || 5.2.16 ||
kāyakarmaṇātmakarma vyākhyātam || 5.2.17 ||
apasarpaṇam [upasarpaṇam] aśitapītasaṃyogāḥ kāryāntarasaṃyogāś cety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.18 ||
tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo prādurbhāvaś ca mokṣaḥ || 5.2.19 ||
dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād abhāvas tamaḥ || 5.2.20

53 Very uncertain; cf. p. 294 below.

tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca || 5.2.21 ||
dikkālāv ākāśaś ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmyān niṣkriyāṇi || 5.2.22 ||
etena karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ || 5.2.23 ||
niṣkriyāṇaṃ samavāyaḥ karmaṇy apratiṣiddhaḥ || 5.2.24 ||
kāraṇatvāt samavāyino guṇāḥ || 5.2.25 ||
guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 5.2.26 ||
kāraṇena kālaḥ || 5.2.27 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre pañcamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vede || 6.1.1 ||
na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam ṛṣeḥ || 6.1.2 ||
tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarmasiddhir liṅgam || 6.1.3 ||
buddhipūrvo dadātiḥ[54] || 6.1.4 ||
tathā pratigrahaḥ || 6.1.5 ||
tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām || 6.1.6 ||
ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt || 6.1.7 ||
aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato 'bhyudayaḥ || 6.1.8 ||
tad duṣṭabhojane na vidyate || 6.1.9 ||
viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ || 6.1.10 ||
same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ || 6.1.11 ||
etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyaḥ [parasvādānaṃ vyākhyātam] || 6.1.12 ||
tathā viruddhānāṃ[55] ca tyāgaḥ || 6.1.13 ||
sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā || 6.1.14 ||
viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ || 6.1.15 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre ṣaṣṭhasyādhyāyasyādyam āhnikam ||

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānām adṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya || 6.2.1 ||
abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthyayajñadāna-prokṣaṇadiṅnakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || 6.2.2 ||
cāturāśramyam || 6.2.3 ||
upadhā ca || 6.2.4 ||
bhāvadoṣa upadhā || 6.2.5 ||

54 The *mahīne cāpravṛttiḥ* found after this sūtra in the manuscript is apparently a result of a strange eyeskip forward, to 6.1.11, though there is no apparent cause for such an error.

55 Assuming that these words, attested by all other versions, underlie the transmitted *tadanuvidhānāñ*: metathesis of *viru* to *ruvi* and misreading of *ru* as *nu* may be one of the steps of corruption involved. If so, the *r/n* confusion suggests an ancestor written in Devanāgarī (cf. p. 260 above).

adoṣo 'nupadhā || 6.2.6 ||
iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ prokṣitam [abhyukṣitaṃ] ca śuci | 6.2.7 ||
aśucīti śucipratiṣedhaḥ || 6.2.8 ||
arthāntaraṃ ca || 6.2.9 ||
ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt | 6.2.10
vidyate cānarthāntaratvād yamasya || 6.2.11 ||
na vyāsaṅgo bhojanavat || 6.2.12 ||
abhisaṃdhiśuddhyabhāvāt || 6.2.13 ||
icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ || 6.2.14 ||
tataḥ saṃyogo vibhāgaś ca || 6.2.15 ||
karmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ || 6.2.16 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

uktā guṇāḥ || 7.1.1 ||
guṇalakṣaṇaṃ coktam || 7.1.2 ||
idam evaṃguṇam [idam evaṃguṇam] iti coktam || 7.1.3 ||
pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ || 7.1.4
agnisaṃyogāc ca || 7.1.5 ||
guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt || 7.1.6 ||
etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam || 7.1.7 ||
apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyanityatvāt | 7.1.8 ||
anityeṣv anityā dravyānityatvāt || 7.1.9 ||
kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajāś ca || 7.1.10 ||
apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pākajā na vidyante || 7.1.11 ||
aguṇavato dravyasya guṇāntarārambhāt karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.12 ||
etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ || 7.1.13 ||
svabhāvavirodhāt || 7.1.14 ||
parimāṇaṃ mānavyavahārakāraṇam || 7.1.15 ||
aṇor mahataś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || 7.1.16 ||
kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || 7.1.17
tadviparītam aṇu || 7.1.18 ||
aṇu mahad iti tasmin [viśeṣabhāvād] viśeṣābhāvāc ca || 7.1.19
ekakālatvāt || 7.1.20 ||
dṛṣṭāntāc ca || 7.1.21 ||
aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvaḥ karmaguṇair vyākhyātaḥ 7.1.22 ||
aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.23 ||
etena dīrghatvahrasvatve vyākhyāte || 7.1.24 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.25 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.1.26 ||

tad anityeṣv anityam || 7.1.27 ||
nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam || 7.1.28 ||
avidyā vidyāliṅgam || 7.1.29 ||
vibhavān mahān ākāśaḥ || 7.1.30 ||
tathā cātmā || 7.1.31 ||
tadabhāvād aṇu manaḥ || 7.1.32 ||
guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 7.1.33 ||
kāraṇena kālaḥ || 7.1.34 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamasyādhyāyasyādyam āhnikam ||

rūparasagandhasparśavyatirekād arthāntaram ekatvam || 7.2.1 ||
tathā pṛthaktvam || 7.2.2 ||
tayor nityānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte || 7.2.3 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.4 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.5 ||
niḥsaṃkhyatvād [guṇa]karmaṇāṃ sarvaikatvaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.6 ||
kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete || 7.2.7 ||
etad anityayor vyākhyātam || 7.2.8 ||
anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ || 7.2.9 ||
etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.10 ||
saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.11 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.12 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.13 ||
yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgā na vidyante || 7.2.14 ||
guṇatvāt || 7.2.15 ||
guṇe ca bhāṣyate || 7.2.16 ||
ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvāt || || 7.2.17 ||
atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāt || 7.2.18 ||
prasaṅgāt || 7.2.19 ||
asti nāstīti prayogāt || 7.2.20 ||
śabdārthāv asambandhau || 7.2.21 ||
saṃyogino daṇḍāt samavāyino viṣāṇāc ca || 7.2.22 ||
adṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ || 7.2.23
anavamṛṣṭagrahaṇāc ca || 7.2.24 ||
tathāpratyayābhāvaḥ || 7.2.25 ||
sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ || 7.2.26 ||
akṛtsnakāritvāt || 7.2.27 ||

sāmayikaḥ śabdād arthapratyayaḥ || 7.2.28 ||
ekadikkālābhyāṃ saṃnikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param aparam 7.2.29 ||
kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇāparatvāc ca paratvāparatve || 7.2.30 ||
paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvāparatvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.31 ||
karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.32 ||
guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.33 ||
iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ [sa] samavāyaḥ || 7.2.34 ||
dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratiṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.35 ||
tattvaṃ bhāvena || 7.2.36 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 8.1 ||
mana ātmā ca || 8.2 ||
jñānanirdeśe jñānaniṣpattir uktā || 8.3 ||
guṇakarmasv asaṃnikṛṣṭeṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca || 8.4. ||
sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam || 8.5 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣāpekṣaṃ dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.6 ||
dravye dravyaguṇa[karmā]pekṣam || 8.7 ||
guṇakarmasu guṇakarmābhāvād guṇakarmāpekṣaṃ na vidyate || 8.8
samavāyiśvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kāryakāraṇabhūte || 8.9 ||
dravyeṣv anitaraviśeṣāt || 8.10 ||
ayam eṣa tvayā bhojanīyam iti buddhyapekṣam || 8.11 ||
dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣv abhāvāt || 8.12 ||
artha iti dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.13 ||
dravyeṣu pañcātmakaṃ pratyuktam || 8.14 ||
bhūyastvād [gandhavattvāc] ca pṛthivī gandhajñāne || 8.15
tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt || 8.16

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre 'ṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asat || 9.1 ||
sad [asat] || 9.2 ||
asataḥ sat kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram || 9.3
sac cāsat || 9.4 ||
yac cānyat satas tad asat || 9.5 ||
asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvāt smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca 9.6
etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ || 9.7 ||

abhūtaṃ nātīta ity anarthāntaram || 9.8 ||
nāsti ghaṭo geha iti sati ghaṭasya gehasaṃyogapratiṣedhaḥ || 9.9 ||
nāsty anyaś candramā iti sāmānyāc candramasi pratiṣedhaḥ || 9.10 ||
sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na || 9.11 ||
ātmany ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam || 9.12 ||
tathā dravyāntareṣu || 9.13 ||
ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāc ca || 9.14 ||
tatsamavāyāt karmaguṇeṣu || 9.15 ||
ātmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu || 9.16 ||
asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṅgikam || 9.17 ||
etena śābdaṃ vyākhyātam || 9.18 ||
hetur apadeśo liṅgaṃ nimittaṃ pramāṇam ity anarthāntaram || 9.19 ||
asyedam iti buddhyapekṣatvāt || 9.20 ||
ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ || 9.21 ||
tathā [svapnaḥ] || 9.22 ||
svapnāntikam || 9.23 ||
dharmāc ca || 9.24 ||
indriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā || 9.25 ||
tad duṣṭaṃ jñānam || 9.26 ||
aduṣṭam etat || 9.27 ||
siddhadarśanaṃ ca dharmebhyaḥ || 9.28 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre navamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmasamavāyaḥ sukhaduḥkhayoḥ pañcabhyo 'rthāntaratve hetus tadāśrayibhyaś ca guṇebhyaḥ || 10.1 ||
iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇaviśeṣād virodhāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthāntarabhāvaḥ || 10.2 ||
saṃśayanirṇayāntarābhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ || 10.3 ||
tayor niṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṃgikābhyāṃ vyākhyātā || 10.4 ||
bhūtam iti pratyakṣaṃ vyākhyātaṃ || 10.5 ||
bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare dṛṣṭatvāt || 10.6 ||
tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo nirapekṣebhyaś ca || 10.7 ||
abhūd ity abhūtāt || 10.8 ||
sati ca kāryāsamavāyāt || 10.9 ||
ekārthasamavāyiṣu kāraṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa ity ekasmin || 10.10 ||
śiraḥ pṛṣṭham pāṇir iti tadviśeṣebhyaḥ || 10.11 ||
kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāt || 10.12 ||
saṃyogād vā || 10.13 ||

kāraṇasamavāyāt karma || 10.14 ||
tathā rūpe kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.15 ||
kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge || 10.16 ||
kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.17 ||
saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikam || 10.18 ||
laiṅgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.19 ||
dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya || 10.20 ||
tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 10.21 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

vaiśeṣikasūtraṃ samāptam ||

3.3.5 Analysis of variants

Contrary to what might, justly enough, be expected, I do not intend here to apply in all respects the same procedure followed with regard to the Ahmedabad manuscript in section 3.2.5 above; in particular variants on the level of readings of a sūtra will be treated much more selectively. I feel that the reconstruction is doubtful at too many places for it to be helpful to collect all instances of patterns of agreements. Before looking at T's readings, however, it may briefly be pointed out that exactly the same considerations which led me to the conclusion that the Ahmedabad manuscript's immediate ancestor also contained the *sūtrapāṭha* with no commentary (cf. p. 230 above) hold good here. Thus here too, although punctuation usually marks the end of a sūtra there are some places where it must clearly be wrong,[56] and here too we find some omissions which must be caused by eyeskip between words in different sūtras.[57]

Now let us look at the sūtras which are omitted or included in T alone (alone being defined here with respect to the three commentary texts).

- Sūtras found in T alone.

  1. 1.1.4 *sādhanāny asya dravyaguṇakarmāṇi.* This sūtra apparently serves to some extent a similar purpose as ŚM's 1.1.4 (on which see p. 234 above); its inclusion may have been (partly) motivated by the desire to express more clearly and explicitly how the actual contents of the VS are relevant to the *dharma* of 1.1.1, which is declared in 1.1.2 to have as its ultimate aim both worldly and supreme good. The fact that only the first three categories are mentioned makes a more archaic impression, however, than ŚM's 1.1.4. In this case it is worth noticing the resemblance with the words with which Candrānanda introduces 1.1.4 ($\approx$ T 1.1.5): *uktaṃ dharmasvarūpaṃ tallakṣaṇaṃ ca* | ***sādhanāny asyedānīṃ dravyaguṇakarmāṇi*** *vakṣyāmaḥ* (2.11). This is certainly striking, but it would be over hasty to conclude that it must point to a relationship; there is nothing particularly specific in the words found in common and even without knowing Candrānanda's commentary it is not unlikely that another Vaiśeṣika author felt something along these lines to be required here. What is more, Praśastapāda also has a sentence which, though less immediately striking in its similarity, could have been the source both of Candrānanda's remark and this sūtra.

56 E.g. *vastre · gandhābhāvaliṃgaṃ* at f. 23r2 (2.2.1).

57 A particularly clear case which allows for no other explanation is *mahaty anekadravyatvāt paramāṇvāv anupalabdhiḥ* for *mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ* (4.1.6) *adravyatvāt paramāvaṇāv anupalabdhiḥ* (4.1.7) at f. 25v2–3.

In the section on *dharma* in the PDhS we read *tasya tu sādhanāni śrutismṛtivihitāni varṇāśramiṇāṃ sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvenāvasthitāni* ***dravyaguṇakarmāṇi*** (272.11–13); note that none of Praśastapāda's commentators see a reference to a sūtra in this.

2. 1.1.18 *dravyatvena pṛthivītvādayaḥ*. There is nothing in any of the commentaries to have suggested this, but it is a not unnatural extension of the discussion of universals in the preceding sūtras (1.2.3–17). No doubt one is meant to supply either *uktāḥ* (as in 1.2.12, 1.2.14 and 1.2.16) or *vyākhyātāḥ*.
3. 6.2.12 *na vyāsaṃgo bhojanavat*. This sūtra resembles nothing in any other recension. Unfortunately, it is not clear to me what exactly it means, though it clearly forms a part of the discussion of the means to *dharma*. Note first of all that the manuscript in fact has *vyāsaṃgaḥ* rather than *vyāsaṃgo*, but I find this uninterpretable.[58] The previous three sūtras deal in particular with the question of *yama*, 'self-restraint,' and whether this is a necessary requirement for *abhyudaya*, without which *śucibhojana* does not have the desired effect. In 6.2.11 (≈ C 6.2.10) *vidyate cānarthāntaratvād yamasya*. Candrānanda, who has the same reading, interprets *anarthāntaratvād yamasya* as meaning 'because *yama* is not distinct from effort (*prayatna*),'[59] which is not very convincing, in view of the fact that none of the preceding sūtras refers directly to *prayatna*. Śaṃkara Miśra, who seems to read as a single sūtra together with the preceding one, has a different interpretation of the same words, understanding them as meaning 'because *yama* is different from eating.'[60] Now the *bhojanavat* in the present sūtra suggests that *anarthāntaratvāt* in 6.2.11 is to be understood with respect to *bhojana*. Still I am not sure what exactly the intended sense is; one possibility would be 'there is no strong attachment [to *yama*] just as [there is none to the] eating [of pure things which leads to *abhyudaya*].'[61] Much depends on whether the exegetical tradition reflected by T agreed with Candrānanda in understanding 6.2.10 (≈ C 6.2.9) as a *pūrvapakṣa* answered by 6.2.11 (≈ C 6.2.10), or whether it is to represent the *siddhānta*, as seems to be the case in Bhaṭṭa

58 For a different possible emendation see the discussion of 6.2.13 on p. 285 below.

59 *na prayatnavyatirekī yamaḥ, prayatnābhāve sarvasyāḥ kriyāyā abhāvād vidyate śuciṃ āhāram upayuñjānasya prayatnaḥ* is Candrānanda's commentary on the sūtra (49.21–22).

60 The relevant part of Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary runs *bhojanād arthāntaraṃ yato yamaḥ* (274.8).

61 In itself, the wording also allows a translation such as 'there is no strong attachment [to *yama*] as [there is to] eating.'

Vādīndra's interpretation, though that commentator appears not to have *yamābhāvāt* in 6.2.10 and omits 6.2.11 altogether.

For another possible reading and interpretation see the following discussion of 6.2.13.

4. 6.2.13 *abhisaṃdhiśuddhyabhāvāt*. This doubtless still belongs to the same discussion as 6.2.12, and is therefore surrounded by much of the same uncertainty. In itself, the sense is plain; one may translate 'because of the absence of purity of intention,' but what ellipsis is to be supplied depends on how the line of argument in the entire group of sūtras is understood.

   One possibility which should be mentioned is that this in fact should be taken as a single sūtra together with the previous one, and that it forms an instance of a sūtra with the syntactical construction *na* plus argument expressed by a word in the ablative (cf. p. 246 and footnote 89 above). In that case, however, the emendation *vyāsaṃgo bhojanavat* may be wrong;[62] one does not expect a nominative.[63] Another, also fairly minor, emendation might be to read *na, vyāsaktabhojanavad abhisaṃdhiśuddhyabhāvāt*, which could mean 'No [there is no exaltation through eating pure food for one who is not self-restrained, as is wrongly maintained by an opponent in 6.2.11 objecting to the *siddhānta* position expressed in 6.2.10], because [such a person] has no purity of intention, just as [in the case of] the eating of someone who has strong attachments.'[64] Here the same observation can be made as in footnote 62 (with regard to a somewhat different interpretation); one would be happier if 6.2.11 read *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya* as is found in A alone.

   Finally, I am conscious that there are still other possible interpretations (and emendations) possible for these two sūtras; *vyāsaṃga* could for in-

62 It might also be right: one could perhaps interpret *na, vyāsaṃgo bhojanavad abhisaṃdhiśuddhyabhāvāt* as 'No [there is no exaltation through eating pure food for one who is not self-restrained, as is wrongly maintained by an opponent in 6.2.11 objecting to the *siddhānta* position expressed in 6.2.10], [for] there is strong attachment [when one is not self-restrained?], because there is no purity of intention as [there must be?] in the case of eating pure food.' This reading of the passage would work much better though, or so it seems to me, if 6.2.11 read *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya* (where one could then take *arthāntara* in the technical sense of 'irrelevant') as is A's reading.

63 The nominative is most natural if *na vyāsaṃgo* is taken together as a syntactical unit, as in the interpretations considered in the discussion of 6.2.12 above. Cf. however also the previous footnote.

64 Yet another alternative would be to render *vyāsaktabhojanavat* 'just as [in the case of] the eating of something to which one is strongly attached.'

stance have been intended in a sense different from that assumed above. I shall not attempt anything like a complete inventory of possibilities, preferring to leave the matter for the present; it is to be hoped that some parallel material may be found which might allow the argument to be reconstructed with more certainty.

5. 7.1.14 *svabhāvavirodhāt*. This sūtra follows the section on *pākaja* qualities, and seems to replace the sūtra *ekadravyatvāt* (thus A and ŚM; cf. p. 256 above) found in one form or another at the same place in the other versions of the *sūtrapāṭha*. The commentators Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra both understand the sūtra in their text as referring to a *virodha*—the colour of the pot (and its atoms) before and after the process of firing is different, and from the (apparent) contradiction of these different colours inhering in the same substance (the atoms according to Candrānanda, the atoms and the pot in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *piṭharapākavāda*) one is led to conclude that the colour (and so on) of earth substances, even the eternal atoms, can be destroyed and produced by conjunction with fire. T's sūtra expresses this a little more clearly perhaps, and it should also be noted that the word *svabhāva* is not found elsewhere in the sūtras.

6. 7.1.15 *parimāṇaṃ mānavyavahārakāraṇam*. This is identical with the opening sentence of the section on size in the PDhS (130.20), and has probably been borrowed from that source, or incorporated from a commentary which quoted it. There is no indication that any of the commentators on the PDhS took the sentence as a quotation.

7. 7.2.18 *atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāt*. This is apparently meant as an additional argument to prove that there is no direct connection between a word and its object. It might be easier to interpret if we 'corrected' the text to *atītānāgatapratyayabhāvāt*; word and object are not directly connected because sometimes the object which we cognize through a word is one which lies only in the past or the future. I am wary of this correction, however. Another possibility would be to take it as a *prasaṅga* argument; because there could be no cognition of a past or future object from words if such cognitions must always based on a real connection between word and object. If this latter interpretation is correct, it raises the question whether this sūtra and the next actually should be read as one,[65] perhaps correcting to *atītānāgatapratyayābhāvapra-*

65 The use of a *halanta* form of *t* at the end of this sūtra suggests that the scribe at least thought it a distinct sūtra, but one need not place too much weight on this.

saṅgāt. Either way, I do not find this argument in the VS commentators or the PDhS.

8. 7.2.19 *prasaṅgāt*. This could belong with 7.2.18, as suggested above, but it might also be intended to provide yet another argument. In the latter case, it is unfortunate that the sūtra does not make clear what *prasaṅga* is involved. Note that the word does not occur elsewhere in the VS, though it is of common occurrence in the *Nyāyasūtra*.

9. 7.2.24 *anavamṛṣṭagrahaṇāc ca*. This seems the most economical correction of the manuscript's *anavamiṣṭagrahaṇāc ca*, though I am not sure exactly how to take *anavamṛṣṭa*. A more or less literal translation could be something like 'And because [one also] grasps something that has not been touched/considered,' but as with 6.2.12–13 it is difficult to be certain how this is supposed to fit in the line of argument. Again there is no resemblance to anything in any other recension. The ablative could be taken as giving a second argument for the thesis put forward at the end of the previous sūtra (*ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*, which I assume should be understood more or less as Candrānanda, who reads the same, does), but it would also be not impossible to construe the ablative with the *tathāpratyayābhāvaḥ* of the following sūtra. In the latter case it could of course be taken together with that as a single sūtra. No other occurrences of *ava*$\sqrt{}$*mṛś* are to be found in the VS, nor for that matter in the *Nyāyasūtra*.

10. 7.2.27 *akṛtsnakāritvāt*. Presumably this sūtra should be taken as an explicative addition, perhaps from a commentary. It would be possible to read it with either the preceding sūtra, *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*, or with the following one, *sāmayikaḥ śabdād arthapratyayaḥ*. In the latter case, which seems to me more likely, it is also possible that it is not intended as a separate sūtra.[66] A possible interpretation would be 'Because [a word] does not perform [its task of conveying a particular sense] for all [people, since some who have not learned the relevant linguistic convention will not have cognition of the object,][67] [the cognition of an object from a word is based on convention].'

- Sūtras omitted in T alone. This is a rather dubious category; I have already supplied several sūtras in the reconstruction which are not in the manuscript

66 In opting to take it as a separate sūtra I allowed myself to be influenced by the fact that the final *t* is written with the *halanta* form rather than forming a ligature with the initial *sā* of 7.2.27.

67 Or 'Because [a word] does not perform [its task of conveying a particular sense] fully (i.e. for all people).' The sense is virtually the same.

(cf. p. 270 above) but it is possible that some of those were already lacking in the hyparchetype, while conversely it cannot be excludeed that the ones mentioned below did belong to it.

1. C 6.1.10–11 ≈ BhV 6.1.10 ≈ ŚM 6.1.7–8. Possibly lost through eye-skip, as 6.1.9 (6.1.6 in ŚM) ends with the same word, *vidyate*, as the second of these sūtras. But this second one appears to lack a counterpart in BhV,[68] and on the chance that this is indeed so and that therefore it is not unanimously transmitted, I have chosen not to supply the two sūtras in T.

To sum up this part of our analysis: T has far more unique inclusions than A did, and these inclusions are interesting and significant, much more so than the omissions of which one cannot rule out that they are accidents of (post-hyparchetype) transmission. Looking at these elsewhere unattested sūtras, there are I think none for which a convincing case could be made that they are 'original,' i.e. of an antiquity equal to that of the main body of the VS. This does not however mean that they are not worth attention; they shed a dim but valuable light on hitherto unknown aspects of the exegesis of the sūtras and the development of the school. Their distribution is interesting, with six out of ten sūtras occurring in the seventh *adhyāya* and four of these in the course of the exposition of a single topic, the relation of word and object. Though there is one case (1.1.4; cf. p. 283) where a relationship might be suspected with Candrānanda's commentary,[69] the others show that there must be other influences at work. The only case where we may feel relatively certain about the origin of a sūtra is 7.1.15, which I think must derive directly or indirectly from the PDhS (cf. p. 286 above); there is a possibility that the same applies to 1.1.4 (cf. p. 284 above).

As for the unique inclusions and omissions of the other four recensions, listed on pp. 232–240 above, it may be noted that none of the inclusions are shared by T; there are however four omissions that are.[70]

68 Cf. footnote 32 on p. 87 above.

69 For other evidence suggesting a relation not merely with C but with Candrānanda's commentary see the remarks apropos of T's 2.1.27 on p. 291 below.

70 Two other cases which should be noted: T 4.1.8 is in fact omitted in the manuscript, though I have supplied it, assuming yet another loss due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton). This is one of the unique omissions of A listed above (p. 237; cf. also p. 241). Nothing can be concluded from this; the possibility of homoeoteleuton as a cause of the omission in either or both of the manuscripts cannot be ruled out. T 4.2.10 *vedaliṅgāc ca* omits what in C is the first half of the same sūtra, namely the words *santy ayonijāḥ*; in ŚM this is a separate sūtra (4.2.10). BhV omits altogether (i.e. does not have *vedaliṅgāc ca* either); cf. p. 237 above.

1. BhV's omission of C 3.2.17 ≈ ŚM 3.2.21 ≈ A 3.2.18. There is no apparent cause of omission for purely mechanical reasons.

2. C's omission of BhV 4.2.5 *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca* ≈ ŚM 4.2.5 *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijaṃ ca* ≈ A 4.2.4 *tad ayonijam* (see p. 247 above). This looks a potentially significant case. There is no apparent reason for the sūtra to be omitted as a simply mechanical variation, and the content of the sūtra seems also a little suspicious. No two of the sources which do have it reads exactly the same, and BhV and ŚM seem somewhat suspiciously close to a sentence in Praśastapāda's PDhS section on earth, running *śarīraṃ* (several manuscripts and editions read *tatra śarīraṃ*) *dvividham, yonijam ayonijaṃ ca*. Its inclusion adds nothing of substance; it only serves to render the structure of the *āhnika* a little clearer, coming as it does between the sūtras which apply to ordinary bodies made of earth and the sūtras aimed at establishing that there are also bodies which are *ayonija*. Remember also that a few sūtras earlier, at the start of this section on bodies, ŚM (alone) had another sūtra that is probably modelled on a sentence from the PDhS (cf. p. 235 above). A offers a more convincing reading, especially since, like BhV and T, it also omits the final mention of *ayonija* bodies at the end of the *āhnika*. The section is also coherent without unnecessary repetition in C: T however would be quite cryptic, as both the sūtras which make clear that the second group of sūtras is arguing for the existence of these extraordinary bodies are omitted. From a text-critical point of view, one might suspect that it is just this omission that is original, and that explanatory sūtras were added at different places in different recensions, ŚM then being anamolous in having both, conceivably due to contamination. The general quality of the transmission of T is not high enough, however, for such a bold conclusion to be fully warranted at present.

3. Like ŚM T omits C 4.2.6 ≈ BhV 4.2.8 ≈ A 4.2.7. Eyeskip (homoeoteleuton) cannot be ruled out; both this sūtra and the preceding one end with °*viśeṣāt*.

4. Like BhV T omits C 6.1.11 *samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ* ≈ ŚM 6.1.8 *tasya samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ* ≈ A 6.1.11 *tatsamabhivyāharato doṣaḥ*. There is a possibility that in one or both recensions the omission is due to eyeskip; cf. on BhV footnote 32 on p. 87 and on A p. 288 above.

5. Like A T omits C 6.2.15 ≈ BhV 6.2.14 ≈ ŚM 6.2.12. This is no evidence for a genetic relationship between the two; A has equivalents of the sūtras that precede and follow this one in C and this omission may have resulted from 'telescoping' of two sūtras (see p. 237 above). T on the other hand omits an

entire group of sūtras (C's 6.2.11–16), replacing them by two which have no relationship with anything in other versions (6.2.12 and 6.2.13; cf. p. 284f. above).

A brief look at the question of organization of the sūtras. Once again, the most interesting point here concerns the last three *adhyāyas*. In these *adhyāyas*, T is the only recension aside from C that has no division into *āhnika*s, a feature which, as remarked above (p. 242) is likely to be ancient. One other detail which must be noted is that the order of T's 2.1.4–5, *apsu śītatā* and *tejasy uṣṇatā*, is the reverse of all other recensions, including A. This looks as if it may be deliberate change, bringing the order of elements mentioned in 2.1.3–5 in line with the order in which they are listed in 1.1.5.

Patterns of other variants of type two and higher on the level of inclusion and omission of sūtras will not be discussed here; the concordance of versions of the VS provided in Appendix 1 will hopefully facilitate the task of those who wish to study these variants in more detail. Instead I now turn to an examination of T on the level of readings of individual sūtras. Some minor variants which stand a good chance of being scribal and are also unlikely to be associated with a different interpretation are not incorporated.

- Sūtras in which T's readings are unique.[71]

    1. 1.1.5 *pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaḥ kālo dig ātmā mana iti nava dravyāṇi*. All other versions read *ākāśaṃ* for *ākāśaḥ*. The use of both genders is well attested. T is the only recension that has the masculine both here and in 5.2.22, but it is very noteworthy that in 7.1.30 (≈ C 7.1.28 ≈ BhV 7.1.31 ≈ ŚM 7.1.22 ≈ A 7.1.29) all versions attest the masculine. The discrepancy is likely, I think, to be an old one, perhaps polished away by a redactor in T. It is not unlikely that it may be taken as a sign of different historical strata.

    2. 1.1.6 *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyā parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś ca guṇāḥ*. For *buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś* C, BhV and A have *buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś* and ŚM the same except *prayatnāś* rather than *prayatnaś*. The differences are minor, but T is likely to be secondary; *sukha* and *duḥkha* or *icchā* and *dveṣa* form pairs as natural as *saṃyoga* and *vibhāga* or *paratva* and *aparatva*.

71 Note that a separate list is given below (p. 298f.) of readings common to A and T alone

3. 1.1.9 *dravyāṇy api dravyāntaram ārabhante*. No other source has the *api*, which serves no very clear purpose.

4. 1.2.8 *dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaraṃ sāmānyam*. All other versions read *sattā* for *sāmānyam*. In the context what is meant, in T too, probably has to be 'being' (*sattā* or *bhāva*), not universals in general, for if that were the case several of the subsequent sūtras, arguing that *dravyatva* and so on also must be accepted as distinct from substance and so on, would be rendered largely redundant. If T's reading is indeed hyparchetypal, it is the *lectio difficilior*, though that is not enough for it to have a real claim to being older.

5. 2.1.15 *vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgaṃ na vidyate*. C, BhV and A[72] read *vāyur iti sati saṃnikarṣe* for *vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe*, and ŚM only *vāyusaṃnikarṣe*. The *sati* could have been omitted due to scribal error, but the manuscript seems to be consistent (cf. the entry for 2.2.1 below) and has been given the benefit of the doubt.

6. 2.1.23 *saṃyogābhāvād abhāvaḥ karmaṇaḥ*. C, BhV and ŚM unanimously read *saṃyogād* for *saṃyogābhāvād*; A omits the sūtra. T's reading may be simply a mistake, but it is perhaps interpretable; not of course as a general statement applying to all motions according to the Vaiśeṣikas, but as a statement of one possible (and common) reason why a particular motion does not exist/arise, which does not require the postulation of ether as a separate substance.[73]

7. 2.1.27 *guṇaḥ saṃl liṅgam ākāśasya*. An interesting case; C, BhV and A have only *liṅgam ākāśasya*, with ŚM reading *pariśeṣāl liṅgam ākāśasya*. Candrānanda, however, introduces the sūtra with the words *tasmād* ***guṇaḥ san***. This is one of the more substantial bits of evidence linking T with Candrānanda's commentary (cf. also p. 283 above), though it should not be regarded as conclusive. The words may have been added independently; as with 1.1.4 the resemblence is striking, but given the context it is quite natural to supply something along these lines, and the wording is not very distinctive. One may compare also Kamalaśīla's *ataḥ pāriśeṣyād* (cf. ŚM's reading) ***guṇo bhūtvākāśasya*** *liṅgam*

72 Though it should be remembered that the manuscript actually omits *sati*: see footnote 33 on p. 218 above.

73 The general line of the discussion of which this sūtra forms part has to do with the question on what basis ether is postulated to exist. 2.1.20 is clearly be taken as a *pūrvapakṣa* proposing that it is (motions such as) going out or in that allow the inference of the substance ether, and the following sūtras are devoted to refuting the validity of this as an inferential mark and proposing that instead it is sound that must be regarded as ether's *liṅga*.

(*Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* 206.6).

8. 2.2.1 *puṣpavastrayoḥ saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre gandhābhāvaliṅgam.* All other versions have *sati saṃnikarṣe* for *saṃnikarṣe*; ŚM alone has *guṇāntarāprādurbhāvo* for *gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo*. The omission of *sati* is consistent with T's reading in 2.1.15 (cf. the entry on that sūtra on p. 291 above).
9. 2.2.19 *sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśayaḥ.* All other versions have *viśeṣasmṛteś ca* for *ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca*. The latter is obviously a secondary, over-explicit reading.
10. 2.2.22 *yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭam ubhayathādṛṣṭatvāt.* If I am right in assuming eyeskip and correcting to this reading, T is alone here. C *dṛṣṭaṃ yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭam ubhayathādṛṣṭatvāt*. BhV reads as two sūtras *yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭam* 2.2.19 and *ubhayathādṛṣṭatvāc ca* 2.2.20, and ŚM has *yathādṛṣṭam ayathādṛṣṭatvāc ca* (a reading which may have been telescoped due to eyeskip).
11. 2.2.28 *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya.* C and A read *acākṣuṣatvān na karma*. BhV is close to T (a rare occurrence): *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya śabdo na karma*; perhaps T should be corrected to read thus, as the reading as transmitted is almost too elliptical. There is however no apparent cause for the omission. ŚM *nāpi karmācākṣuṣatvāt*. The *pratyakṣasya* seems to me likely to be an addition.
12. 2.2.32 *kāryatvāc ca.* All other versions have merely *kāryatvāt*.
13. 2.2.33 *śabdavyañjakābhāvāt.* C *abhāvāt*, A *śabdavyañjaka abhāvāt*. It is possible that T should be emended to agree with A, or (less probably) the other way around, but since I cannot rule out either reading as impossible, I have chosen to accept the transmitted text in both cases.
14. 2.2.34 *kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt.* C, BhV[74] and A *kāraṇato vikārāt*. ŚM has two sūtras, *anityaś cāyaṃ kāraṇataḥ* 2.2.28 and *na cāsiddhaṃ vikārāt* 2.2.29. ŚM is doubtless secondary; the two words of the (probably original) C-BhV-A reading have apparently been supplemented (though in line with an exegesis which differs from both Candrānanda's and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentaries). I am not certain how T's reading, if it is not corrupt, is to be interpreted.
15. 2.2.38 *dvayoḥ pravṛttyor abhāvāt.* All other versions, including A, have *dvayos tu* for *dvayoḥ*. In general, my feeling is that readings with

74 Thus, correctly in my view, in Thakur's edition of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary; printed *kāraṇavato vikārāt* in his edition of the short version.

fewer particles as syntactic tags are likely to be more original, i.e. that it is much more frequent that particles are added during the course of transmission to facilitate rapid comprehension than that they are removed. Whether this may be an exception to the general rule it is impossible to say.

16. 3.1.10 *prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād apadeśasya*. For *prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād* C has *prasiddhapūrvakatvād* and BhV, ŚM and A *prasiddhipūrvakatvād*. The °*bhūta*° may be a scribal error, provoked by the confusing 3.1.9 with its many *bhūta*s and *abhūta*s; if that is the case, T would agree with C alone.

17. 3.2.4 *prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmaliṅgāni*. ŚM and A have *cātmano* for *cety ātma*°; ŚM is otherwise identical. C and A read *sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś* for *sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś*, and BhV *parātmani* for *sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmaliṅgāni*. The compounding is at any rate consistent with the reading in 1.1.6 (see the brief discussion on p. 290 above), though I am inclined to prefer the C and A reading. Cf. also p. 255 above.

18. 3.2.6 *devadatta iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ liṅgaṃ na vidyate*. For *devadatta iti* C and A read *yajñadatta iti sati*, BhV *ahaṃ yajñadatta iti* and ŚM *yajñadatta iti*.

19. 3.2.11 *devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīty upacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ*. Every source has a slightly different reading of this sūtra, though the differences are small. See p. 246 above.

20. 3.2.16 *nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ*. Another sūtra where everyone differs. C *nānā vyavasthātaḥ*, BhV *sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmye na vyavasthā* (joined with the previous sūtra), ŚM *vyavasthāto nānā* and A *nānāvasthātaḥ*. Interesting is that T's unique reading is supported by some quotations of the sūtra in commentaries on the PDhS:[75] Śrīdhara (NK 220.8) and Udayana (KĀ 99.5) have exactly the same form, while Vyomaśiva once quotes it as *vyavasthāto nānātmānaḥ* (Vyo² vol. 1 11.8) and once as *sukhaduḥkhavyavasthāto nānātmānaḥ* (Vyo² vol. 1 153.16). The presence of the word *ātmānaḥ* in the sūtra may therefore be of some antiquity; nonetheless I think it is an addition. One can imagine that the addition of the word would be felt to be desirable particularly if the sūtra was quoted, in situations

75 The PDhS itself refers to the sūtra merely with *vyavasthāvacanāt saṃkhyā* (scil. *ātmaguṇaḥ*) (70.14–15).

where its context—the discussion of the soul and its qualities which allow one to infer its existence—would not be directly available. It may be possible that T has been influenced by the wording as quoted in Udayana or Śrīdhara's commentary.

21. 4.1.1 *yad akāraṇavat tan nityaṃ*. This is closest to C's *sad akāraṇavat tan nityam*; BhV and ŚM read *sad akāraṇavan nityam*. T's reading is doubtless secondary, though it may be hyparchetypal: with the introduction of the relative pronoun it is the *lectio facilior*.

22. 4.1.4 *nityam iti ca viśeṣataḥ pratiṣedhābhāvaḥ*. Other versions have the negative in a different place: C (and A) *anityam iti ca viśeṣapratiṣedhabhāvaḥ*, ŚM *anitya iti viśeṣataḥ pratiṣedhabhāvaḥ*. BhV does not appear to have the sūtra. T makes equal sense, and is perhaps 'easier' in that *nityam* is mentioned a few sūtras earlier, at 4.1.1 (see above).

23. 4.2.3 *manaātmasaṃyogas tv avipratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām*. Cf. the brief note on A's 4.2.3 at p. 247 above. The unique and interesting feature of T is the *manaātmasaṃyogaḥ* where C, BhV and A have only *ātmasaṃyogaḥ* and ŚM *aṇusaṃyogaḥ* (if his 4.2.4 is not regarded as a different sūtra rather than a variant). The sūtra, and especially the word *ātmasaṃyogaḥ* forms something of a problem for Candrānanda, who resorts to interpreting *ātman* as *svarūpa* here. The order of words in the compound in T is suspicious, since at other places we always find *ātmamanaḥ*°.

24. 5.1.7 *saṃyogabhāve na gurutvāt patanam*. I am not at all certain that this reading is hyparchetypal, and if it is, there is a certain inconsistency with the wording of later sūtras, 5.1.13 and 5.2.13. Other possibilities would be *saṃyogābhāvena gurutvāt patanam*, which would also be anomalous, or simply correcting to agree with the other versions, which have *saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam*. The last makes for the greatest consistency in wording; I have hesitated from choosing for this mainly because there is no clear reason for the added *akṣara*; the carelessness of our scribe seems to manifest itself frequently in the omission of *akṣaras* but the only other insertions are such as are clear cases of dittography or the like.

25. 6.2.4 *upadhā ca*. C and A[76] (*cāturāśramyam*) *upadhāś cānupadhāś ca*.[77] BhV *upadhānupadhāś ca*, ŚM *cāturāśramyam upadhā anupa-*

76 C reads as one sūtra together with the previous one, and it is possible that A should [illegible]

77 Jambūvijaya prints *cāturāśramyam upadhāś cānupadhāś ca* in his edition of C but I believe this to be an error resulting from misreading of the Śāradā ligatures [illegible] and [illegible]

dhāś ca. It is quite possible that the T reading is a result of eyeskip. The singular, however, is in itself perhaps more logical than a plural.

26. 6.2.16 *karmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ*. All other recensions have *ātmakarmasu* for *karmasu*. There is no visible cause for a mechanical error; *ātma°* may have been omitted to avoid drawing attention to the difficulty the 'classical' Vaiśeṣika has with references in the sūtras to motions of the soul. With simply *karmasu* the sūtra would presumably be taken as a reference to the fifth *adhyāya* in general.

27. 7.1.12 *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇāntarārambhāt karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ*. C,[78] A and possibly BhV[79] read *guṇārambhāt* for *guṇāntarārambhāt*, while ŚM does not have the sūtra. T has what may be called the *lectio facilior*.

28. 7.2.14 *yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgā na vidyante*. All other versions have the expected dual *saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete*.

29. 7.2.17 *ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvāt*.[80] All other versions, including A, read merely *niṣkriyatvāt*. The addition is clearly explanatory, and in fact recalls the *ubhayor gamanaṃ nāsti* with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra introduces the sūtra.

30. 7.2.18 *asti nāstīti ca prayogāt*. C, ŚM and A (BhV lacks the sūtra) read *asati nāstīti ca prayogāt*. T's *asti* may be an involuntary corruption, but it seems interpretable, and it is therefore conceivable that it belongs to the hyparchetype.

31. 7.2.23 *adṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*. All other recensions that have an equivalent (ŚM does not), whether as a separate sūtras as in C (and, arbitrarily, in A) or joined with the preceding one as in BhV, read *dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*. The present reading could well be a simple scribal error, but on the other hand, such is the obscurity of the entire passage, it makes perhaps just as good sense. For example, Candrānanda explains

78 Or rather, J_1 and J_1^S; note that the Śāradā manuscripts read *guṇāntarārambhāt* as in T. The Jaina manuscript has been accepted here by both Jambūvijaya and myself, chiefly because the commentary has *aguṇasya dravyasyaivotppannasya kāraṇaguṇair guṇā janyante* (53.12), but the presence of the T reading in the Śāradā manuscripts may suggest that it too was at least known in Kashmir.

79 This is somewhat hypothetical: see footnote 37 on p. 111 above. It is also conceivable that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra knew T's reading instead.

80 It should be noted that Isaacson 1995, 759 wrongly reports T as reading *ubhayopagamanān* rather than *ubhayopagamanābhāvān*.

his equivalent 7.2.21 as meaning that the examples given by an opponent in the preceding sūtra—in support of his thesis that word and object must be connected because we have cognition of an object from a word—fail to prove the point, because with the cow and its horn, for instance) the two are actually seen to be connected, but the connection between word and object is not seen. Clearly T's reading would be possible and slightly easier as an answer to the preceding sūtra with basically the same intention: it could be rendered 'because [a connection between word and object] is not seen [in the way the connections in the examples given in 7.2.22 are], the cognition [of an object from a word] is not a valid inferential mark [to prove that word and object are connected.'

For further remarks on possible interpretations of the entire passage with particular reference to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's readings see the edition and translation of his commentary on 7.2.22–23 in part 1 above.

32. 8.9 *samavāyiśvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kāryakāraṇabhūte*. For *samavāyi°* all other versions have *samavāyinaḥ*. Here the compounding is likely to be secondary; apart from its poor attestation it removes what might be felt as a lack of symmetry by making both ablatives into genitive tatpuruṣas. For *te* ŚM alone reads *te ete*.

33. 8.10 *dravyeṣv anitaraviśeṣāt*. This looks like a telescoping of what in other versions is two sūtras. C *dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ*[81] *kāraṇāyaugapadyāt* 8.10. *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇāviśeṣāt* 8.11. BhV *dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ pratyayāḥ kāraṇāyaugapadyāt* 8.1.11.[82] *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇaviśeṣāt* 8.1.12. ŚM *dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ* 8.1.10. *kāraṇāyaugapadyāt kāraṇakramāc ca ghaṭapaṭādibuddhīnāṃ kramo na hetuphalabhāvāt* 8.1.11. But T cannot be explained merely by eyeskip, for we would then expect the element that caused the error, the (°)*kāraṇā°*, to be found once. And T's reading seems interpretable as an argument for the proposition put forward in the following sūtra (though that may admit for more than one interpretation); a possible reading of the two, which if this is correct could equally well be combined as a single sūtra, would be 'Because with respect to

81 Read thus for the °*kāraṇāt* printed by Jambūvijaya; cf. Isaacson 1995, [illegible] and footnote 25 on p. 150 above.

82 The *kāraṇakramāc ca ghaṭapaṭādibuddhīnāṃ kramo na hetuphalabhāvāt* added after this in square brackets by Thakur is another unnecessary adoption of an anomalous reading in ŚM which there is no reason to think was known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. It has doubtless entered into Śaṃkara Miśra's *sūtrapāṭha* from the explanation of *kāraṇāyaugapadyāt* in some commentary.

the substances [involved] there is no difference from [what is denoted by] the other [words], [references to the same person by different pronouns and in different cases, as when we say] 'this [person],' 'that [person],' 'you should eat' [and so on] are dependant on cognition [i.e. have a subjective element].' Things would be smoother perhaps if we correct at least to *dravyeṣv anitaretaraviśeṣāt*, assuming haplography, and there is no doubt no serious objection to that.

34. 8.11 *ayam eṣa tvayā bhojanīyam iti buddhyapekṣam.* In omitting the word *kṛtam* T is relatively closest to A and BhV, both of which read *bhojayainam* for *bhojanīyam* (cf. p. 255 above). T may represent a corruption of this reading; the reverse is less likely, since *bhojayainam* is also found in C and ŚM.
35. 8.16 *tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt.* For *rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt* C reads *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*, BhV *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu* (with *rasarūpasparśāt* as a separate sūtra), ŚM *rasarūpasparśāviśeṣāt* and A *rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*; see the brief discussion on p. 251 above. T's reading does not inspire much confidence.
36. 9.6 *asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvāt smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca.* The *asati* for *asad iti* in all other versions stands a very good chance of being a scribal error. I have tentatively let it stand unamended, though, as it seems conceivable that it could be interpreted. The ending of the sūtra differs slightly from what we find elsewhere, with *virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca* where C and BhV have *virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca jñānam*, the Sena court version *virodhipratyakṣatvāj jñānam* and ŚM *virodhipratyakṣavat*.

- Sūtras in which T shares a reading with C against BhV and ŚM.

  1. 1.2.4 *bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva.* BhV (and A) have merely *bhāvaḥ*, and ŚM *bhāvo 'nuvṛtter eva hetutvāt sāmānyam eva.* Cf. p. 254 above.
  2. 2.2.12 *ita idam iti yatas tad diśo liṅgam.* BhV and A (cf. p. 254 above) reads *diśāṃ* and ŚM *diśyaṃ* for *diśo*. The singular of A and C is more logical than a plural, for there is but one substance space—note the singular (in all versions) in the list of substances at (T) 1.1.5, and at (T) 5.2.26—and it is that substance which is the subject here, not the directions.[83]

83 Further confirmation for the *diśo*, though that may be thought unnecessary, may be found in the fact that it is with this word that the sūtra is quoted by Kamalaśīla (*Tattvasaṃgragapañjikā* 207.4) and Abhayadevasūri (*Tattvabodhavidhāyinī* 669.12).

3. 2.2.36 *saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpatteḥ.* BhV, ŚM and A have *śabdaniṣpattiḥ* for *śabdaniṣpatteḥ*, and ŚM further has *ca śabdāc* for *chabdāc*. I feel the reading of C and T here is not convincing: Candrānanda accounts for the ablative by adding by way of *avataraṇa* the words *kutaḥ kāryatvam* (scil. *śabdasya*) *ity āha* (23.1) but there is nothing in the sūtras to justify it.
4. 3.1.11 *viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo viṣāṇī tasmād gaur iti ca.* T has been restored here, assuming that the omission of *viṣāṇī tasmād aśvo* in the manuscript is due to homoeoteleuton. A has the same except for omitting the final *ca*; see further p. 245 above.
5. 3.2.10 *yadi ca dṛṣṭapratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto yajñadatta iti.* See p. 246 above.
6. 7.1.7 *etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam.* See for variants and discussion p. 253 above.

- Sūtras in which T shares a reading with BhV alone.

1. 1.1.24 *dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca.* C and A *dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgāś ca.* ŚM *dvitvaprabhṛtayaḥ saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca.* The differences are small and the variant not likely to be of textual significance.

- Sūtras in which T shares a reading with ŚM against C and BhV

1. 3.2.3 *prayatnāyaugapadyāj jñānāyaugapadyāc caikam.* Thus also A; see p. 245 above.

- Sūtras in which T shares a reading with A alone.[84]

1. 1.1.25 *asamavāyāt sāmānyaṃ kāryaṃ karma na vidyate.* See the brief comment on A 1.1.24, p. 243 above.
2. 1.2.9 *ekadravyatvān na dravyam.* See the comments on A 1.2.9, p. 243 above.
3. 1.2.12 *ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam.* See the note on A 1.2.12, p. 243 above.
4. 2.1.11 *adravyatvād dravyam.* See the note on A 2.1.11, p. 244 above.

84 Another striking resemblance between A and T, though the readings are not identical, is found in 2.2.33; cf. p. 292 above.

5. 2.1.12 *kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ca*. See the comments on A 2.1.12, p. 244 above.
6. 2.2.10 *nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt*. See the brief comment on p. 244 above.
7. 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ*. Cf. pp. 240 and 244 above.
8. 3.1.13 *pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam*. Cf. p. 245 above.
9. 4.1.6 *mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ*. Cf. the note on A 4.1.6, p. 247 above. Note that T's text has been restored, assuming eye-skip in the manuscript; cf. footnote 57 on p. 283 above.
10. 6.1.6 *tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām*. See the brief comment on p. 249 above.
11. 7.2.29 *kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇāparatvāc ca paratvāparatve*. The rather over-explicit addition of *paratvāparatve*—lacking in the versions of the commentaries—may have been independent in A and T.
12. 9.5. *yac cānyat satas tad asat*. It will be remembered that A's reading is very uncertain here; see the brief comment on p. 252 above.

3.3.6 Evaluation

Briefly, despite the mangled state in which the sūtras are preserved in this manuscript, I think it possible to assert with confidence that the hyparchetype contained a version of the VS significantly different from any other. And, again, it is very implausible that it should have descended from one of the other recensions. Of the recensions on which we have commentaries, though, T is on the whole closest to C, though this is so to a less pronounced degree than with A. As remarked above, the insertions in T are particularly interesting; though often tantalizingly obscure, they afford brief glimpses of arguments which do not seem to be attested in other Vaiśeṣika sources. They are however also a sign that the *sūtrapāṭha* of T has been 'tampered with' to a greater extent than A; in general T seems to have more 'individuality' than A, but to preserve fewer potentially original readings. Nonetheless there are some readings which deserve serious consideration, and the fact, for example, that T is the only recension to agree with C in its organization of the final three *adhyāyas* should serve to remind us that even a generally unreliable line of transmission of a text may preserve archaic features that are lost in versions which are in most respects superior.

3.4 Conclusion

The pages above represent, or so it is to be hoped, only the beginning of the study of manuscripts of the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS. It is hoped that they have succeeded in demonstrating that A, and even T despite its evident faults, should be consulted in any investigation of the sūtras and their exegesis and development.

Finally, it should be stressed that I have by no means made an exhaustive search for manuscripts with the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS. It may I think be regarded as certain that a really dedicated effort to find such manuscripts will turn up many more, and it is quite likely that some of these will, like the two I have treated here, prove to be independent of the versions transmitted to us together with a commentary. One factor which may render the unearthing of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts more difficult is that it is to be expected that as with the two treated briefly above, many will prove to contain the VS as only one of a number of texts, and often not as the first. Such 'Sammelhandschriften' run a greater risk than normal to be inadequately catalogued, as it is necessary to go through them with some care to note all the texts contained therein, for which many harried cataloguers faced with daunting numbers of manuscripts may well not spare the time.

Other representatives of the A and T recensions would be very welcome indeed, but it would not be very surprising if still further different versions of the *sūtrapāṭha* come to light. The search for *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, and indeed for any other Vaiśeṣika texts which may survive in hitherto unnoticed manuscripts, remains, in my view, among the most urgent priorities.

APPENDIX 1

CONCORDANCE OF THE RECENSIONS OF THE VS

The publication over the past forty years or so of various recensions of the VS differing from that of Śaṃkara Miśra, which till then had held sway as the only version which needed to be seriously taken into account, has been a blessing which brought with it one minor drawback—gradually things have reached the stage that only perhaps the most resolute and knowledgeable explorer does not occasionally lose his way in the ever denser jungle of variant readings and different numberings. Some charts have, it is true, been published which provide a degree of help in this confusion—one may mention Honda's *A Reading in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* of 1990 and especially Nozawa's *A Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of 1985. Nonetheless even Nozawa's work, for all that it has saved me and doubtless many others time and trouble, has its drawbacks in that it perpetuates certain mistakes particularly in the *sūtrapāṭha* of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.[1]

Having been guilty myself of increasing the complexity of the situation yet further by the publication here of tentative reconstructions of two further versions of the VS, I feel it incumbent on me to make what amends I can, and have chosen to do so by offering here a tabular concordance of all the recensions that are presently available. In it, separate columns have been reserved not only for BhV—i.e. the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as far as it can be determined now, with the aid of Thakur's edition of the fragments of the long version of the commentary and with consultation of the manuscript of the abridged version—but also for the earlier attempts to reconstruct this version, i.e. that given in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of the commentary (siglum BhV_T), that in the second *pariśiṣṭa* of Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary (siglum BhV_J), and that given by Nozawa (siglum BhV_N).[2] The numbering given by Tha-

1 Note that in this publication Nozawa refers to the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary as 'anonymous' and does not discuss its relation with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. Earlier, in his article dealing with the *sūtrapāṭha* associated with this (version of the) commentary (1974), Nozawa appears to accept Thakur's judgement that it is an abridgement of the long commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, but with some reservations.

2 Something about the merits of these various attempts has been said in the introduction to Part 1,

kur for the portions of the *sūtrapāṭha* contained in the fragments he has published of the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary has been left out of the concordance though; it seemed unnecessary to reserve yet another column for on account of this incomplete and seldom referred to[3] numbering of the *sūtrapāṭha*. I regret that I have not felt ready at present to give the actual *sūtrapāṭha* as followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra itself: many problems on the level of wording remain, which still require further deliberation.[4] This table has thus a more limited aim than Nozawa's or than Honda's *Reading*: those publications provide not merely a concordance but all readings as well.[5]

The left hand column gives a continuous numbering: only those sūtras which were in my view wrongly supposed to be part of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*, and which are not attested by other versions in the same place, have not been allotted a number.

Concordance of recensions of the VS									
Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_{Jy}	SM	S	A	T
				Adhyāya 1 *āhnika* 1					
1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
4						4			
5									4
6	4	4	4	4	4	5		4	5
7	5	5	5	5	5	6		5	6
8	6	6	6	6	6	7		6	7
9	7	7	7	7	7	8		7	8
10						9			
11	8	8	8	8	8	10a		8	9
12	9	9	9	9	9	10b		9	10

pp. 48ff. Note that in the BhV_{Jy} column I have followed the method Nozawa used in her 1974 article to number sūtras which were not printed as such in Thakur's edition, i.e. as 1.2.4-1 and so on. In the *Comparative Table* of 1985 Nozawa does not give these sūtras a number, but only an asterisk.

3 The only scholar I am aware of who seems to have made use of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara* at all is Halbfass, and I have not noticed any places where he refers to a sūtra by the numbering given therein.

4 Aside from the portions reedited in Part 1, I have given a number of emendations and corrections to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha* at various places in this thesis, particularly in Part [illegible].

5 Honda's work is not quite a full concordance, as he does not provide numbering for each individual version, instead merely stating under each sūtra whether one or other recension omits it or has variants and what those variants are. He also has not taken the *sūtrapāṭha* of the 'Sena Court' commentary, given by Thakur in his 1965 article, into account. On the other hand, he has helpful supplementary material such as occasional reference to citations of the sūtras in other texts and to secondary literature.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_N	ŚM	S	A	T
13	10	10	10	10	10	11		10	11
14	11	11	11	11	11			11	12
15						12			
16	12	12	12	12	12	13		12	13
17	13	13				14		13	14
			13	13	13				
			14	14	14				
18	14	14	15	15	15	15		14	15
19	15	15	16	16	16	16		15	16
20	16	16	17	17	17	17		16	17
21	17	17	18	18	18	18		17	18
22	18	18	19	19	19	19		18	19
23	19	19	20	20	20	20		19	20
24	20	20	21	21	21	21–22		20	21
25	21	21	22	22	22	24		21	22
26	22	22	23	23	23	23		22	23
27		23	24	24	24				
28	23	24	25	25	25	25		23	24
29	24	25	26	26	26	26		24	25
30	25	26	27	27	27	27		25	26
31	26	27	28	28	28	28		26	27
32	27	28	29	29	29	29		27	28
33	28	29	30	30	30	30		28	29
34	29	30	31	31	31	31		29	30
Adhyāya 1 *āhnika* 2									
35	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
36	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
37	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
38	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4
39	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5
40	6	6	6	6	6	6		6	6
41	7	7	7	7	7	7		7	7
42	8	8	8	8	8	8		8	8
43	9	9		9	8+1			9	9
44	10	10	9	10	9	9		10	10
45	11	11				10		11	11
46	12	12	10	11	10	11		12	12
47	13	13	11	12	11	12		13	13
48	14	14	12	13	12	13		14	14
49	15	15	13	14	13	14		15	15
50	16	16	14	15	14	15		16	16
51	17	17	15	16	15	16		17	17
52									18

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV[illegible]	BhV[illegible]	BhV[illegible]	SM	S	A	T
53	18	18	16	17	16	17		15	19
				Adhyāya 2 āhnika 1					
54	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
55	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
56	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
57	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4
58	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5
59	6	6	6	6	6	6		6	6
60	7	7	7	7	7	7		7	7
61	8	8	8	8	8	8		8	8
62	9	9	9	9	9	9		9	9
63	10	10	10	10	10	10		10	10
64	11	11	11	11	11	11		11	11
65	12	12				12		12	12
66	13	13	12	12	12	13		13	13
67	14	14	13	13	13	14		14	14
68	15	15	14	14	14	15		15	15
69	16	16	15	15	15	16		16	16
70	17	17	16	16	16	17		17	17
71	18	18	17	17	17	18		18	18
72	19	19	18	18	18	19		19	19
73	20	20	19	19	19	20		20	20
74	21	21	20	20	20	21			21
75	22	22	21	21	21	22			22
76	23	23	22 23[6]	22	22 23[6]	23			23
77	24a	24	24	23	24	24		21	24
78	24b	25–26	25–26	24–25	25–26	25		22	25
79	25	27–29	27–29	26–28	27–29	26		23	26
80	26	30	30	29	30	27		24	27
81	27	31	31	30	31	28		25	28
82	28	32	32	31	32	29		26	29
83						30			
84						31			
				Adhyāya 2 āhnika 2					
85	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
86	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
87	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
88	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	5
89	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	4

6 This sūtra should be regarded as a quotation in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary of [illegible] and not as the same words occurring twice as different sūtras. Cf. the brief [illegible] on p. 233 above.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_N	ŚM	S	A	T
90	6	6	6	6	6	6		6	6
91	7	7				7		7	7
92	8	8				8		8	8
93	9	9	7	7	7			9	9
94	10	10	8	8	8	9a		10	10
95	11	11	9	9	9	9b		11	11
96	12	12	10	10	10	10		12	12
97	13	13				11		13	13
98	14	14	11	11	11	12		14	14
99	15	15	12	12	12	13		15	15
			13		13				
			14		14				
100	16	16	15	13	15	14		16	16
101	17	17		14		15		17	17
				15					
102	18	18	16	16	16	16		18	18
103	19	19	17	17	17	17		19	19
104	20	20	18	18	18			20	20
105	21	21				18		21	21
106	22	22–23	19–20	19–20	19–20	19		22	22
107	23	24	21	21	21	20		23	23
108	24	25	22	22	22	21		24	24
109	25							25	25
110	26	26				22		26	26
111	27	27	23	23	23	23		27	27
112	28	28	24	24	24	24		28	28
113	29	29	25	25	25	25		29	29
114	30	30	26	26	26	26		30	30
115	31	31	27	27	27	27		31	31
116	32	33			28+1			32	32
117	33							33	33
118	34	32	28	28	28	28–29		34	34
119	35	34	29	29	29	30		35	35
120	36	35	30	30	30	31		36	36
121	37	36	31	31	31	32		37	37
122	38	37	32	32	32	33		38	38
123	39	38	33	33	33			39	39
124	40					34		40	40
125	41	39	34	34	34	35		41	41
126	42	40	35	35	35	36		42	42
127	43a	41	36	36	36	37		43	43
128	43b							44	44

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV[illegible]	BhV[illegible]	BhV[illegible]	SM	S	A	T
129	43c[7]	42	37	37	37			45	45
				Adhyāya 3 āhnika 1					
130	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
			2	2	2				
131	2	2	3	3	3	2		2	2
132	3	3	4	4	4	3		3	3
133	4	4	5	5	5	4		4	4
134	5	5	6	6	6	5		5	5
135	6	6	7	7	7	6		6	6
136	7	7	8	8	8	7		7	7
137	8[8]	8	9	9	9	8		8	8
138	9	9	10–16	10	10–16	9–13		9	9
139	10	10	17	11	17	14		10	10
140	11	11	18	12	18	15a		11	
141	12	12	19	13	19	15b		12	
142	13					16–17		13	11
143	14	13	20	14	20	18		14	12
144	15	14	21	15	21	19		15	13
				Adhyāya 3 āhnika 2					
145	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
146	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
147	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
148								4	
149	4	4	4	4	4	4		5	4
150	5	5	5	5	5	5		6	5
151	6	6	6	6	6	6		7	6
152	7	7	7	7	7	7		8	7
153	8	8	8	8	8	8		9	8
154	9	9	9	9	9	9		10	9
155	10	10	10	10	10	10		11	10
156						11			
157	11			11		12		12	11
158	12	11	11	12	11	13		13	12

7 On Candrānanda's 2.2.43 see the brief discussion in footnote 55 on p. 232 above.

8 I add this, with some hesitation, as it is present in J_1; cf. the *[illegible]* of Jambuvijaya's edition, p. 228–229. It is difficult to be certain whether Candrānanda knew it or not, but Jambuvijaya writes: *atra candrānandaracitavṛttau [illegible] tathāhi [illegible] arthāntarasyānapadeśaḥ' iti sūtram [illegible] candrānandasya [illegible] niścetum na pāryate* (228.18–20). It is easy to imagine that the sūtra, and perhaps some commentary thereon, has been lost in both J_1 and the Śāradā manuscripts [illegible]; on the other hand there remains a suspicion that it may have been added in J_1 by a transmitter who knew the sūtra from a different version of the VS. As a result of my accepting it into the text of this *āhnika*, the numbers given under C here are one higher than in Jambuvijaya's edition until the end of this *āhnika*.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_N	ŚM	S	A	T
159	13	12	12	13	12	14		14	13
160						15			
161						16			
162	14	13	13	14	13	17		15	14
163						18			
164	15	14a	14a	15	14a	19		16	15
165	16	14b	14b		14b	20		17	16
166	17					21		18	17
			Adhyāya 4 *āhnika* 1						
167	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
168	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
169	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
170	4					4		4	4
171	5	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
172	6	5	5	5	5	6		6	6
173	7	6	6	6	6				7
174	8	7	7	7	7	7			8
175	9	8				8			9
176	10	9	8	8	8	9		7	10
177	11	10	9	9	9	10		8	11
178	12	11	10	10	10	11		9	12
179	13	12	11	11	11	12		10	13
180	14	13	12	12	12	13		11	14
			Adhyāya 4 *āhnika* 2						
181						1			
182	1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1
183	2	2	2	2	2	3		2	2
184	3	3	3	3	3	4		3	3
185		4	4	4	4				
186		5	5	5	5	5		4	
187	4	6	6	6	6	6		5	4
188	5	7	7	7	7	7		6	5
189	6	8	8	8	8			7	
190	7	9	9	9	9	8		8	6
191	8	10	10	10	10	9		9	7
192	9a					10			8
193	9b					11		10	9
			Adhyāya 5 *āhnika* 1						
194	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
195	2					2		2	2
196	3	2	2	2	2	3		3	3
197	4	3	3	3	3	4		4	4
198	5	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
199	6	5	5	5	5	6		6	6

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV$_T$	BhV$_J$	BhV$_W$	SM	S	A	T
200	7	6	6	6	6	7		7	7
201	8	7	7	7	7	8		8	8
202	9	8	8	8	8	9		9	9
203	10	9	9	9	9	10		10	10
204	11	10	10	10	10	11		11	11
205	12					12		12	12
206	13	11	11	11	11	13		13	13
207	14	12	12	12	12	14		14	14
208	15	13	13	13	13	15		15	15
209	16	14	14	14	14	16		16	16
210	17	15	15	15	15	17		17	17
211	18	16	16	16	16	18		18	18
				Adhyāya 5 āhnika 2					
212	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
213	2					2		2	2
214	3	2	2	2	2	3		3	3
215	4								
216	5	3	3	3	3	4		4	4
217	6	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
218	7	5	5	5	5	6		6	6
219	8	6	6	6	6	7		7	7
220	9					8		8	8
221	10	7	7	7	7	9		9	9
222	11	8	8	8	8	10		10	10
223	12	9	9	9	9	11		11	11
224	13	10	10	10	10	12		12	12
225	14	11	11	11	11	13		13	13
226	15					14		14	14
227	16–17	12–15	12–15	12–15	12–15	15–16		15–16	15–16
228	18	16	16	16	16	16		17	17
229	19	17	17	17	17	17		18	18
230	20	18	18	18	18	18		19	19
231	21	19	19	19	19	19		20	20
232	22			20		20		21	21
233	23	20	20	21	20	21		22	22
234	24	21	21	22	21	22		23	23
235	25	22	22	23	22	23		24	24
236	26			24		24		25	25
237	27	23	23	25	23	25		26	26
238	28	24	24	26	24	26		27	27
				Adhyāya 6 āhnika 1					
239	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
240	2	2	2	2	2			2	2
241	3	3	3	3	3	2		3	3

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_N	ŚM	S	A	T
242	4	4	4	4	4	3		4	4
243	5	5	5	5	5	4		5	5
244	6	6	6	6	6			6	6
245	7	7	7	7	7	5		7	7
246	8	8	8	8	8			8	8
247	9	9	9	9	9	6		9	9
248	10	10	10	10	10	7		10	
249	11					8		11	
250	12	11	11	11	11	9		12	
251	13	12		12		10		13	10
252	14					11		14	11
253	15					12		15	12
254	16	13	12	13	12	13		16	13
255						14			
256	17	14	13	14	13	15		17	14
257	18	15	14	15	14	16		18	15
				Adhyāya 6	*āhnika* 2				
258	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
259	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
260	3a	3	3	3	3	3a		3	3
261	3b	4	4	4	4	3b		4	4
262	4	5	5	5	5	4a		5	5
263	5	6				4b		6	6
264	6	7	6	6	6	5		7	7
265	7	8	7	7	7	6		8	8
266	8	9	8	8	8	7		9	9
267	9	10	9	9	9	8a		10	10
268	10					8b		11	11
269	11	11	10	10	10	9		12	
270	12	12	11	11	11	10		13	
271	13					11		14	
272	14	13	12	12	12			15	
273	15	14	13	13	13	12			
274		15	14	14	14				
275	16	16	15	15	15	13		16	
276									12
277									13
278	17	17				14		17	14
279	18	18–19	16–17	16–17	16–17	15		18	15
280	19	20	18	18	18	16		19	16
				Adhyāya 7	*āhnika* 1				
281	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
282	2	2		2	1+1			2	2
283	3	3		3	1+2			3	3

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV_T	BhV_J	BhV_N	SM	S	A	T
284	4	4		4	1+3	2		4	4
285	5	5		5	1+4			5	5
286	6	6		6				6	6
287	7	7	2	7	2	3		7	7
288	8	8	3	8	3	4		8	8
289	9	9	4	9	4	5		9	9
290	10a	10	5	10a	5	6a		10a	10a
291	10b	11	6	10b	6	6b		10b	10b
292	11a	12	7	11	7			11a	11a
293	11b	13		12	7+1			11b	11b
294	12	14	8	13	8			12	12
295	13	15	9	14	9			13	13
296	14	16	10	15	10	7		14	
297									14
298									15
299	15	17	11	16	11	8		15	16
300	16	18	12	17	12	9		16	17
301	17	19		18	12+1	10		17	18
302	18	20	13	19	13	11		18	19
303	19	21	14	20	14	12		19	20
304	20	22	15	21	15	13		20	21
305	21	23	16	22	16	14		21	22
306						15			
307	22	24	17	23	17	16		22	23
308	23	25	18	24	18	17		23	24
309	24a	26	19	25	19			24	25
310	24b	27	20	26	20			25	26
311	25	28	21	27	21	18		26	27
312						19			
313	26	29	22	28	22	20		27	28
314	27	30	23	29	23	21		28	29
315	28	31a	24a	30a	24a	22a		29	30
316	29	31b	24b	30b	24b	22b		30	31
317	30	32	25	31	25	23		31	32
318	31	33	26	32	26	24		32	33
319	32	34	27	33	27	25		33	34
				Adhyāya 7 āhnika 2					
320	1a	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
321	1b	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
322	2	3		3	2+1			3	3
323	3	4		4				4	
324	4	5	3	5	3	3		5	
325	5a	6	4	6	4			6	4
326	5b	7	5	7	5			7	5

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV$_T$	BhV$_J$	BhV$_N$	ŚM	S	A	T
327	6	8	6	8	6	4		8	6
328						5			
329	7	9	7	9	7	6		9	
330	8	10	8	10	8	7		10	7
331	9	11	9	11	9	8		11	8
332	10	12	10	12	10	9		12	9
333	11	13	11	13	11	10		13	10
334	12	14	12	14	12	11		14	11
335	13a	15	13	15	13	12a		15	12
336	13b	16	14	16	14	12b		16	13
337	14	17	15	17	15	13		17	14
338	15	18		18	15+1	14		18	15
339	16	19	16	19	16	15		19	16
340	17	20	17	20	17	16		20	17
341									18
342									19
343	18					17		21	20
344	19	21	18	21	18	18		22	21
345	20	22a	19a	22a	19a	19		23	22
346	21	22b	19b	22b	19b			24	23
347									24
348	22	23		23a	19+1a			25	25
349	23	24		23b	19+1b			26	26
350									27
351	24	25	20	24	20	20		27	28
352	25	26	21	25	21	21		28	29
353	26	27	22	26	22	22		29	30
354	27	28	23	27	23	23		30	31
355	28a	29	24	28	24	24		31	32
356	28b	30	25	29	25	25		32	33
357	29	31	26	30	26	26		33	34
358	30	32	27	31	27	27		34	35
359	31	33	28	32	28	28		35	36
				Adhyāya 8					
360	1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1		1.1	1
361	2	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2	2
362	3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3		1.3	3
			1.3		1.3				
363	4a	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4		1.4a	4a
364	4b	1.5		1.5	1.4+1			1.4b	4b
365	5	1.6[9]				1.5		1.6	5

9 This sūtra is absent in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, but is quoted in a discussion in the full version: see p. 28 above and footnote 75 there.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV$_T$	BhV$_J$	BhV$_N$	SM	S	A	T
366	6	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.6		1.6	6
367	7	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7		1.7	7
368	8	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8		1.8	8
369	9	1.10	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9		1.9	9
370	10a	1.11a	1.9	1.10a	1.9	1.10		1.10	10
371	10b	1.11b	1.10a	1.10b	1.10a	1.11a		1.11	
372			1.10b		1.10b	1.11b			
373	11	1.12		1.11	1.10+1			1.12	
374	12	1.13	1.11	1.12	1.11	2.1		1.13	11
375	13	1.14	1.12	1.13	1.12	2.2		1.14	12
376	14	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3		1.15	13
377	15	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4		2.1	14
378	16	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.5		2.2	15
379	17	2.4–5	2.4–5	2.4–5	2.4–5	2.6		2.3	16
				Adhyāya 9					
380	1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1	1	1
381	2					1.2	2	2	2
382	3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	3	3	3
383	4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	4	4	4
384	5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	5	5	5
385	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	6	6	6
386	7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	7	7	
387	8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	8	8	7
388	9					1.9	9	9	8
389	10					1.10	10[10]	10	9
390	11						[11]	11	10
391	12						[12]	12	11
392	13					1.11	[13]	13	12
393	14					1.12	[14]	14	13
394	15						15	15	14
395						1.13			
396	16					1.14	16	16	15
397	17					1.15	17	17	16
398	18					2.1	18[11]	18	17
399						2.2			

10 After this a folio is lost in the unique manuscript of S. I have assumed that it is most probable that the following four sūtras attested by C, A and T also belong in this *sūtrapāṭha*, and have given them numbers, though placed withing square brackets. Thakur instead continues by numbering the next sūtra preserved (15 in the numbering here) 11, and similarly the subsequent sūtras 12–18 have numbers in his edition lower by 4 than the numbers given here.

11 After this the manuscript of S is again defective; though a fair amount of commentary on this sūtra is preserved there are a number of folios missing before the next one which contains a sūtra. Again I assume the presence in the *sūtrapāṭha* of those sūtras which are unanimously attested by other versions and allot them bracketed numbers; as a result sūtras 22–2[illegible] have numbers in

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV$_T$	BhV$_J$	BhV$_N$	ŚM	S	A	T
400	19					2.3	[19]	19	18
401	20					2.4	[20]	20	19
402	21					2.5	[21]	21	20
403	22					2.6	22	22	21
404	23a					2.7	23	23	22
405	23b					2.8	24	24	23
406	24					2.9	25	25	24
407	25					2.10	26	26	25
408	26					2.11	27	27	26
409	27					2.12	28	28	27
410	28					2.13	29	29	28
				Adhyāya 10					
411	1						1	1.1	1
412	2					1.1	2	1.2	2
413	3					1.2	3	1.3	3
414	4					1.3	4	1.4	4
415	5						5	1.5	5
416	6						6	1.6	6
417	7						7	1.7	7
418	8					1.4	8	1.8	8
419	9					1.5	9	1.9	9
420–1[12]	10–11					1.6–7	10–11	1.10–11	10–11
422	12					2.1	12	1.12	12
423	13					2.2	13	1.13	13
424	14					2.3	14	1.14	14
425	15					2.4	15	1.15	15
426	16					2.5	16	1.16	16
427	17					2.6	17	1.17	17
428	18					2.7	18	1.18	18
429	19						19	1.19	19
430	20					2.8	20	2.1	20
431	21					2.9	21	2.2	21

Thakur's edition lower by 7 than they have here.

12 ŚM and S on the one hand and C, A and T (the latter two only conjecturally) divide into two sūtras at different places.

APPENDIX 2

CONCORDANCE OF MANUSCRIPTS OF CANDRĀNANDA'S COMMENTARY

The following table gives folio and line references to the beginnings of the various subdivisions of the VS in the manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary, and references to the corresponding pages in Jambūvijaya's edition, for which the siglum E_J is used.

Concordance

VS	J_1^S	J_1	J_2^S	J_2	$Ś_1$	$Ś_2$	$Ś_3$	E_J
1.1	1v1	6r12	1r1	3v18	6r1	1v2	22r15	1
1.2	1v11	9v3	1r10	5v13	8r27	4r18	24r8	8
2.1	2r3	10v3	1r15	6r18	9r15	5r11	24v5	11
2.2	2r12	12v7	1v3	7v9	11r4	7r4	25v7	16
3.1	2v10	15r12	1v13	9r12	13r23	9r27	26v21	25
3.2	3r3	16v1	1v18	9v16	14v2	10r21	27r19	28
4.1	3r9	18r6	2r5	10v18	16r13	11v14	28r5	32
4.2	3v2	19r1	2r10	11r17	17r3	12r23	28r22	35
5.1	3v4	19v3	2r13	11v11	17v4	12v23	28v8	36
5.2	3v11	20v11	2r19	12v3	18v13	13v25	29r10	40
6.1	4r9	22v11	2v9	13v11	20v5	15r28	30r10	45
6.2	4v2	24r4	2v14	14r18	21v11	16r20	30v10	48
7.1	4v7	25r9	2v19	15r7	23r4	17r14	31r11	52
7.2	5r4	27r2	3r17	16r7	24v15	18v6	32r4	57
8	5v2	29r1	3r17	17r12	26v2	20r7	33r3	62
9	5v8	30v1	3v3	18r7	27r20	20v19	33r22	66
10	6r4	32v11	3v11	19v5	29v4*	22r18*	34r21*	72

* All Ś manuscripts omit the beginning of 10: cf. p. 149 above.

APPENDIX 3

ON THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE PDHS

1 Recent work on the text of the PDhS

In an important article published a decade ago, in 1985, Marui drew attention—for the first time, as far as I know—to the fact that the text of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* (also known as *Padārthapraveśa(ka)* or *Praśastapādabhāṣya*)[1] poses textual problems which still demand considerable attention. He opens by making the following observations.

> It is a century since the text of Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* or *Praśastapādabhāṣya* was edited for the first time. Yet, as is the case with the majority of the texts of Indian Philosophy, very little attention has been paid to the textual problems of this most important work of Vaiśeṣika system. Of course, there cannot be the least doubt that the transmission of *Praśastapādabhāṣya* is far better than that of *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (= *VS*). When one compares various editions of *Praśastapādabhāṣya* (=*PBh*) with one another, one may not find such "big" differences as one does among various versions of *VS*. It must be admitted, however, that the task of textual criticism cannot be avoided even for this "apparently" well-preserved text, at least when its testimonial value with reference to *VS* is brought under consideration. (Marui 1985, 106)

Anyone who seriously occupies himself with Vaiśeṣika studies cannot but be in agreement with these words, though I should add that in my view the qualification expressed in the last sentence is hardly necessary; it is by no means only when references to the VS are concerned that the text of the PDhS requires critical attention. Later in the article Marui makes some further remarks which I should like to call attention to and with which I once more wholly concur in all material points.

1 On the various names by which we find the PDhS referred to see Chemparathy 1969.

> Thus, although the number of the editions of *PBh* that have come out is, one should say, relatively large, yet the task of collecting MSS has not been done much, especially since V [i.e. Dvivedin's 1895 edition] was issued. It does not mean however, that the need for studying MSS is not great. On the contrary, what has ever been done for establishing the *PBh* text is far from satisfactory. (Marui 1985, 110)
>
> In this way, the text of *PBh* has not yet been fully established; in other words, the critical (in the true sense of the word) edition of *PBh* still remains a desideratum. Since I cannot afford to venture upon an independent research of all the MSS, I must content myself by making the following remark as a sort of summary: in the context where the choice of correct reading is crucial, one should take the trouble to collect all the alternative readings possible out of the four editions of *PBh*, i.e., L [i.e. Kṛṣṇaśāstrin's edition],[2] V, B and G, and in doing so, one should give heed to, above all, the reading(s) attested to by the three commentators, i.e., Vyomaśiva, Śrīdhara and Udayana, while at the same time taking into account the possibility of the *PBh* text having been transmitted through different lineages at the times of those commentators. (Marui 1985, 111)

Fortunately, Marui's article appears to have been paid due heed, for since its publication more than one scholar has done useful work towards improving the situation. As a preliminary to offering some fresh observations I shall briefly review and attempt to assess the relevant publications, as far as they are known to me.[3]

First of all, one must mention Tanaka's article of 1987, in which he gives a transcription of a birch-bark manuscript in Śāradā script preserved in Kashmir University (I refer to this manuscript in the following with the siglum $Ś_1$). In the very brief introduction to the transcription he observes, without referring to Marui's article, that 'unfortunately, although we have various editions of *PDS*, one can not say the task of collating MSs have [sic] been done satisfactorily,' a remark which is certainly true, though the explanation immediately given, '[i]t is due to the fact that almost all MSs of *PDS* are either incomplete or quite indistinct' (Tanaka 1987, 1) is one which is very unlikely to do justice to all the factors involved. The manuscript transcribed in this article is indeed an important one, and Tanaka points out that it was not used in any of the editions. A few folios from the manuscript are reproduced in the article, and it is thus possible to establish that Tanaka's transcription is on the whole

2 There is a certain bibliographic confusion about the edition referred to here. An attempt to clear it up is made below, in footnote 16 on p. 320.

3 Despite expectations which might be raised by its title, S. Peeru Kannu's *The Critical Study of Praśastapādabhāṣya*, Delhi 1992, has no claim to be included in the survey below.

reasonably reliable.[4] At just a few places errors or what may be presumed to be errors in the transcription lead one to doubt whether Tanaka's understanding of the text is very precise;[5] there are also a large number of word-divisions, or absences of word-divisions, which reinforce this doubt.[6]

In 1990 a very useful tool for the (text-)critical study of the PDhS was made available by the publication of a word-index to the frequently used Dvivedin edition of the PDhS. This was compiled by Honda, to whom we owe many other works of the same useful and self-effacing nature, and included as an appendix to his Japanese translation of the PDhS together with Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*.

In 1991 Tanaka published a second article of relevance to the manuscript transmission of the PDhS. The main part of this publication consists of a transcription of the *dravya* section of the PDhS from two manuscripts; the same birch-bark manuscript he had transcribed in its entirety in 1987 and another manuscript, on the same material and in the same script, from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (my siglum $Ś_2$). Tanaka begins however with the following paragraph.

> A good many Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha (PDS)*, also called *Praśastapādabhāṣya* or *Padārthapraveśa* are kept in many educational institutes in India and elsewhere. According to

4 There are—inevitably perhaps—some inaccuracies and mistakes. For instance, in the transcription of f. 6r the *daṇḍa* after *parimāṇaṃ* in line 2 should be deleted, in line 4 Tanaka does not report that the scribe clearly first wrote *sarvopalabdhinimittaṃ* and corrected this to *śabdopalabdhinimittaṃ* (as transcribed) by cancelling *sarvo* and adding *śabdo* above the line, and in line 7 the MS has a double, not a single, *daṇḍa* after *iti*. There are a few places where Tanaka's transcription is probably a misreading which cannot be checked, as the relevant folios are not reproduced. For instance in the very last line of the final colophon (f. 40v10) *vighuhante* is I suspect a misreading by Tanaka of *vighnahantre*, rather than a mistake of the scribe in a phrase which he almost certainly did not copy but formulated himself.

5 Thus at f. 6v10–11 *paramarṣibhiś=crutismṛtilokasaṃvyavahārārthaṃ* (Tanaka uses = to indicate that there is a word-break, but that the manuscript has a ligature) for *paramarṣibhiś=śruti°* which is undoubtedly what the scribe wrote (the ligatures *śś* and *śc* are virtually indistinguisable in Śāradā script), and, in the transcription of a marginal note on f. 2r *vijātīyetyo* (which is senseless) for *vijātīyebhyo*; in the second case the folio is fortunately reproduced and it can be clearly determined that the latter is what was actually written, despite the admitted resemblance between the ligatures *ty* and *bhy* (and indeed between *t* and *bh* in general) in Śāradā script.

6 For instance, to give only a few examples, at f. 1v4 *ca śabdasamuccitāś=ca* for *caśabdasamuccitāś=ca*, at f. 2r4 *dravyatvādyaparam* for *dravyatvādy=aparam*, at f. 2r5–6 *sāmānyaṃ sadviśeṣākhyām* for *sāmānyaṃ sad=viśeṣākhyām*, at f. 2r8 *iha pratyayahetuḥ* for *ihapratyayahetuḥ* (the same mistake is repeated in the transcription at f. 39r10–11), at f. 3r9 *saptasaṅkhyādayaḥ* for *sapta saṅkhyādayaḥ*, at f. 3v2–3 *anapekṣyaśukraśoṇitaṃ* for *anapekṣya śukraśoṇitaṃ*, at f. 5v12 *ayāvad=dravyabhāvitvād* for *ayāvaddravyabhāvitvād*, at f. 6v12–13 *savituryе saṃyogālokapālaparigṛhītadikpradeśānām* for *savitur=ye saṃyogā lokapālaparigṛhītadikpradeśānām* and so on.

> various catalogues, the total number of manuscripts is about one hundred. It is a very difficult task to collect and compare them all. However, I have so far collected 36 manuscripts in microfilms or in photostats and have made a comparison between them. I am now engaged in codifying them. (Tanaka 1991, 1)

The article also includes a list of the thirty-six manuscripts referred to, with a few details (Tanaka 1991, 3).

The transcription is again reasonably reliable,[7] as far as representation of the *akṣaras* in the manuscript is concerned, but, like the one Tanaka had published earlier, it frequently errs in the matter of word-division. None of the mistakes of this kind in the 1987 article (cf. footnote 5 on p. 317 above) have been corrected in the transcription of the same manuscript given anew here.

A far more important shortcoming must be noted, however, which did not play a significant role in the case of $Ś_1$, as far as I can tell, but which seriously reduces the value of the transcription of the BORI manuscript. This is that Tanaka fails to indicate the many places where there are corrections written also in Śāradā script but by a second, in my view clearly later, hand.[8] In such cases Tanaka merely gives the text as corrected, though there is no remark made on this fact.[9] To illustrate: in the description of *vāyu* Tanaka transcribes from $Ś_2$ (f. 4r7) *tatra kāryalakṣaṇaś caturvidhaḥ*. There is no way a reader without access to the manuscript could know that the word *tatra* has been inserted in the margin by a second hand. Again, on the same side (f. 4r10), Tanaka transcribes *pṛthivyādyanabhibhūtair vāyvavayavair ārabdhaṃ sarvaśarīravyāpi tvagindriyam* without indicating that *sarva°* is an interlinear addition by the later hand.

The presence of corrections of this type is in itself something which it is very important to note. I have no doubt that it points to the manuscript having been collated at some time against another manuscript of the PDhS. A further indication pointing to the same conclusion is the fact that at some places the first scribe left an open gap, doubtless because his exemplar was lacunose at that place, which has been filled in (appropriately) by the second hand.[10] This too has gone unmentioned by Tanaka.

7 The article contains no reproductions of the newly collated manuscript. I have been able to consult it from photographs, thanks to the friendly help of Mr. F. Janssen and Dr. J.E.M. Houben.

8 These corrections are probably written by the same person who has added some marginal annotation, not mentioned or transcribed by Tanaka.

9 Neither here nor in his 1994 book does Tanaka introduce any convention to indicate syllables or words as having been secondarily added, nor are there any footnotes on his transliterations, which he describes as 'literal' and 'unamended' (1991, 4).

10 For instance at f. 5v2, where the first scribe wrote *vi*, left a gap, and continued *t paramamahat*. The later hand filled up the gap from another source, writing in the missing °*bhavavacanā*°. On the same side, in line 8, he has completed the word *bādhiryam* by adding the °*dhirya*° for which

All this means that we have a record of conflation taking place almost in front of our eyes, and Tanaka's failure to report accurately what the manuscript's readings were before as well as after correction has the serious consequence that his transcription cannot be reliably used in determining the relation between the manuscripts.[11]

A treatment of the section on inference in the PDhS, containing the Sanskrit text with variants based on four editions, was published in 1992 by Nenninger. The book, a revised version of a M.A. thesis presented at the University of Hamburg, has as its chief aim an investigation of the *trairūpya* doctrine particularly as set forth in Praśastapāda's work.[12] As a presentation and evaluation of Praśastapāda's theory of inference, Nenninger's work is very successful, combining accuracy with clarity in a way that is far too rare.[13] Though it was clearly not his intention to (re)examine the PDhS section on inference from the standpoint of textual criticism, in his efforts to arrive at a precise understanding of what the Indian author says, Nenninger, not surprisingly perhaps, noticed places where the text, or a reading of a particular edition, seemed 'wrong,' and has pointed out such cases,[14] though he did not allow himself to be distracted from his main concerns into an attempt to arrive at a solution to these difficulties. It is therefore a subsidiary merit of his book to have increased our awareness of the need for further text-critical work on the PDhS.

In an article that appeared in 1994, a revised version of a paper presented in Vienna at the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference in 1990, I drew attention at two places to textual problems of the PDhS, also referring to Marui's article. In footnote 13 on p. 146, after justifying a correction to the printed editions,[15] I wrote: 'While this particular question of word order is relatively unimportant, it may serve as yet

a space had been similarly left blank.

11 See on this point and its methodological consequences p. 333ff. below.

12 Nenninger himself uses the following words (among others) to explain the goals of his book. 'Daß wir [i.e. Nenninger and his supervisor Oetke] uns... zur Veröffentlichung meiner Arbeit entschlossen haben, hat mehrere Grunde. Zum einen wird die Interpretation der *trairūpya*-Lehre hier am konkreten Beispiel des Padārthadharmasaṃgraha ausführlich dargestellt. Dies mag für all jene Leser von Interesse sein, welche sich auch in anderer Weise mit Praśastapāda befassen. Außerdem erleichtert der mögliche Rückbezug auf den in seiner Gesamtheit wiedergegebenen Textabschnitt das Verständnis der doch recht komplexen und schwierigen *trairūpya*-Interpretation. Dieses Buch versteht sich somit als eine Einführung in die indische Logik" (Nenninger 1992, vii).

13 Cf. the review by Bronkhorst in *Asiatische Studien* 1993 [appeared in 1994], 703–707.

14 See especially p. 34 n. 20, p. 38 n. 41 and p. 91; note also the slight doubt expressed by Nenninger at p. 50 n. 87.

15 At the time I wrote the words 'all editions of the PDhS available to me read °*paramāṇuvāyu*°' (1994, 146 n. 13) I had no access to the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin edition, which has the reading °*vāyuparamāṇu*° which I proposed. From the Bronkhorst/Ramseier collation it appears that it is the only edition that reads thus.

another illustration of the need for a new and more critical edition of the PDhS, a labour which the present author has undertaken and hopes to complete in the near future.' It should be remarked that at the time these words were written I was unaware of Tanaka's article of 1991.

Two important book-length publications also appeared in 1994. Bronkhorst and Ramseier jointly produced a *Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya*, subtitled *a complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Neither the title nor the sub-title does full justice to the contents of the book, for aside from the word-index, which covers pp. 89–169, we find also the complete text of Praśastapāda's work (pp. 1–88) with an apparatus containing all the variants obtained from a collation of the twelve editions known to them[16] as well as some

16 A certain amount of bibliographic confusion with regard to the extant editions of the PDhS has arisen from conflicting reports in various publications. Nine editions were listed by Marui, who divides them into four 'in editing which manuscripts were made use of' (1985, 107) and five which are not based on manuscripts (1985, 109–110). He could not of course refer to the 1991 edition (with the *Nyāyakandalī*) by Jetly and Parikh, and he also does not make use of the 1983–1984 two-volume edition (with the *Vyomavatī*) by Gaurinath Shastri. Neither of these seems to draw on fresh manuscript evidence for the text of the PDhS: if I am not mistaken all the manuscript readings in the Jetly/Parikh edition are already found in Jetly's 1971 edition (with the *Kiraṇāvalī*). The only edition in Marui's list that cannot be directly matched with one used by Bronkhorst and Ramseier is described by Marui as 'Edited, with *VS*, by Kṛṣṇaśāstri. Lahore 1890' (1985, 107). Tanaka also lists nine editions (1994, xvi), eight of which are again easily identified, and describes the third on the list as '*Vaiśeṣikadarśanam of Śrī Kaṇādamuni*, with *Praśatapādabhāṣya* of Praśastapādācārya. Ed. by Śrī Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, Sanskrit Book Dept., Lahore, 1921/22.' Bronkhorst and Ramseier have used a different Lahore edition, dated 1889, with a title-page (transcribed by Bronkhorst and Ramseier, p. xiv) mentioning the presumed editor with the words *śrīmatpaṇḍitalekharājena mahatā pariśrameṇānveṣitam*." They also describe an edition by Śrīkṛṣṇaśāstrin in the following way: 'Vaiśeṣikadarśanam. Śrīkaṇādamunipraṇītam. Jālandharavaidikapāṭhaśālamukhyāvyāpaka""śrīkṛṣṇaśāstrinirmitaṭippaṇīsamalaṃkṛtaṃ praśastapādācāryaviracitaṃ tadīyabhāṣyam. ŚRĪKṚṢṆAŚĀSTRInā saṃskṛtam. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press 1943' (1994, xiv). All this might well give the impression that four different editions are concerned. This is not the case. At any rate the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin editions referred to by Marui and by Bronkhorst and Ramseier are in fact identical. The apparent discrepancy has arisen from the fact that neither Marui nor Bronkhorst and Ramseier have described the publication completely accurately, Marui's account being particularly sketchy. Bronkhorst and Ramseier have transcribed almost all the information on the title-page, but have omitted some important points. After *śrīkṛṣṇaśāstriṇā saṃskṛtam* | there is a line in English reading '*All Rights reserved with the Sanskrit Book Depôt Lahore*.' Furthermore, after the place of publication is given (*mumbayyāṃ*) we read *lavapurīyasaṃskṛtapustakālayādhyakṣeṇa mihiracandreṇa nijā'dhikārato "nirṇayasāgarākhya" yantrālaye mudrayitvā prasiddhiṃ nītam* | . Most importantly, the date is then given as *śakābdaḥ 1812 saṃvat 1946*. The publication therefore appeared not in A.D. 1946, as one would suppose from the information given by Bronkhorst and Ramseier but in 1889/1890; exactly when cannot be determined without a month-date. This is then doubtless the same as Marui's 'Lahore 1890' edition, and is indeed based on three manuscripts, like the edition Marui describes. I suspect strongly that it is also the same as the edition Tanaka

gleaned from the three oldest commentaries, and with what amounts to a complete concordance of all the editions, in the form of marginal page-references. Though Bronkhorst and Ramseier say virtually nothing about the text they give, it is abundantly clear that it has no pretensions to be a critical edition, and is mainly given simply to be able to conveniently refer to in the word-index. As far as I can see, their policy has been to give the readings of the 1966 edition by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Miśra (their siglum *M*) in the main body of the text; at least this is the only siglum that does not seem to occur in the apparatus.

Compared with Honda's word-index, the work of Bronkhorst and Ramseier, taking the readings of all the editions into account, has many advantages. The word-index is considerably more detailed than Honda's, and it is also very much to be welcomed that one can actually read the text[17] and have the variants available in the apparatus; of course one has to remain aware while doing so that one will have to make one's own decisions on the value of the various readings.

Finally, another important publication by Tanaka, likewise dating from 1994, has been kindly brought to my attention by Dr. J.E.M. Houben, whom I must also thank for providing me with photocopies of a portion of the book. It seems to consist of nothing less than a complete collation of the *dravya* section of the PDhS of thirty-four of the thirty-six manuscripts listed in Tanaka's 1991 article.[18] The preface (also dated 1994) reads as follows.

> A good number of Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* (PDhS) or the *Praśastapādabhāṣya* has been preserved in the institutions in and outside of India. They have facilitated the critical studies of this important work of Vaiśeṣika philosophy. However, although we have various editions of this work, one cannot say that the task of collating manuscripts have [sic] been done satisfactorily. It is due to the fact that those editions have been edited on the basis of the

refers to, though I cannot explain the error in the date, and it is possible that Tanaka's book is a reprint.

* An unfortunate misunderstanding of this phrase has led to Potter's *Bibliography* giving the name of the editor as Lekharaja Mahat Parisrama (1983, 28 no. 490). Incidentally Potter's *Bibliography* does not list the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin edition.

** This is a mistranscription for °*mukhyādhyāpaka*°.

17 I have noticed only one significant error in the text given; on p. 44 (§234) for *tatrākṣam akṣaṃ sotpadyata iti pratyakṣam* read *tatrākṣam akṣaṃ pratītyotpadyata iti pratyakṣam*. Fortunately this has not led to a corresponding mistake in the word-index.

18 Quite mysteriously, nos. 16 and 17 of the list given in Tanaka 1991 (p. 3) are not mentioned in the more detailed list of collected manuscripts in Tanaka 1994, xi–xv, though a place has been left open for them, so to speak, as the numbering given there jumps from 15 to 18. They are also not incorporated in the collated transcriptions, as far as can be judged from the three pages thereof available to me in photocopies.

> manuscripts of the *Nyāyakandalī* and *Kiraṇāvalī*, which are the commentary [sic] on PDhS, and a few manuscripts of PDhS as the materials.
>
> In 1979, a research group in Kashmir Buddhism of Bukkyo University brought photo copies of many manuscripts from Kashmir. Among them, we could find out the manuscript of the *Padārthapraveśa* which is another name of PDhS. Throughout our comparative study of the manuscript with various editions, we came to know that no edition has so far dealt with this manuscript.
>
> At this point, we decided to re-edit the PDhS by using this manuscript. In addition to that, we have been provided a number of manuscripts of PDhS from many places of India as reader can see in the list of collected manuscripts.
>
> We have undertook the project of editing a critical text of PDhS. The present work is the first part of the romanized text of PDhS manuscripts. Its principal aim lies in providing fundamental materials for further critical and systematic studies of PDhS. (Tanaka 1994, iii)

From this it appears that the volume (and the volumes which are announced as forthcoming, containing collations of the manuscripts Tanaka has collected for the rest of the text of the PDhS) is in the nature of preliminary work for a critical edition. This is again suggested by the remark, on p. vi, that '[t]his romanized text is a sort of a report of the long process which is not accomplished yet.'

At the time that I started to work towards a critical edition of the PDhS I was aware of Tanaka's 1987 article but did not know that he was and had been doing preparatory work with a view to the same goal. At the University of Hamburg, in the summer-semester of 1992, I read through and discussed a draft edition of the *dravya* section and the beginning of the *guṇa* section with Prof. Dr. A. Wezler, Mr. D. Goodall and Mr. C. Nenninger, to all of whom I am very much indebted for suggestions and critical comments which have stimulated my reflections on individual as well as methodological problems.

Having become aware of the extent of Tanaka's work, I have for the present postponed trying to finish my edition. I have a high opinion of the value of Tanaka's labours on the manuscripts of the PDhS, and regard his published collations as useful for anyone reading Praśastapāda's work, as well as being of interest as a collection of material casting light more generally on the *usus scribendi* of Indian scribes and the transmission of texts. Unfortunately, as long as Tanaka continues to fail to report both readings *ante correctionem* and *post correctionem* (cf. p. 318 above), the usefulness of his work has an important limitation.

As yet it is impossible to say anything of the critical edition that appears also to be pending; none of Tanaka's publications that I have seen discusses in any detail the relationship between the manuscripts,[19] the use of the commentaries in establishing the text, other testimonia for the text of the PDhS, or indeed the general problems involved in attempting to edit Praśastapāda's work critically. Presumably we may expect all this to be touched upon as Tanaka's work progresses. In the meantime, I shall offer a few observations based on my experience in working with the problems of the PDhS.

2 Sources for a critical edition of the PDhS

2.1 The manuscript tradition

It is not clear how many manuscripts of the PDhS are in existence at present. In 1991 Tanaka had collected copies of thirty-six MSS and estimated on the basis of manuscript catalogues that the total number is about a hundred (Tanaka 1991, 1; see p. 317 above). In his 1994 publication, Tanaka gives a 'List of Collected Manuscripts' (xi–xv) which contains thirty-four of the thirty-six he had mentioned in the earlier article (cf. footnote 18 above), together with eighteen additional manuscripts, all deposited in the Sampūrṇānanda Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, in Vārāṇasī. These additional manuscripts are not however included in the actual collations. In total, this amounts therefore to fifty-two manuscripts. He further adds a 'Catalogue list of *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha*' (xvi–xviii); this has, as he tells us, been taken over from vol. 11 of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (NCC), pp. 109–110 (s.v. *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha*) with '[s]ome added by us' (Tanaka 1994, xvi). This lists thirty-four catalogues (some unpublished) which apparently contain 63 entries,[20] but allowing for overlapping (the same manuscript being described in different catalogues) the number of manuscripts involved is probably 59. The list does not include the additional 21 manuscripts listed in vol. 13 of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (published in 1991) s.v. *Praśastapādabhāṣya*.

19 Perhaps it should be pointed out that here and in the following, when I speak of 'the relationship between the manuscripts' or use similar expressions I usually mean what could more precisely be expressed as 'the relationship between the states / versions of the text found in the manuscripts.' It may be important in many contexts to distinguish strictly between the manuscripts themselves and the states of a text that they record; cf. especially Dearing 1983, 1–8 and the (in my opinion very well-judged) critical remarks thereon in Tanselle 1990, 284–288. For the very limited purposes of a preliminary consideration of the problem on hand, however, I think it sufficient to concentrate in the main on textual states, while finding it less cumbersome to frequently use 'manuscript' as a short-hand for 'textual state preserved in a manuscript.'

20 I have not counted item 17 from Tanaka's list, which seems to concern only a 'scroll… containing titles of Sanskrit works with author-names' which presumably mentions the PDhS.

Moreover, as Tanaka indicates (1994, vi), many manuscripts of the PDhS have not been catalogued, while others have been wrongly catalogued.[21] Without being able to be at all definite, I think it is to be expected that the number of manuscripts in existence is in fact well in excess of a hundred, perhaps closer to two hundred.

Such a number of manuscripts obviously in itself already poses very considerable practical problems for an editor. It should be noted, however, that only a small percentage of these manuscripts contains the text of the PDhS more or less complete. Out of the fifty-two manuscripts collected by Tanaka thirty-two contain only of the *dravya* section, in whole or in part. Though Tanaka understandably enough calls these 'incomplete,' my own examination of the manuscripts in his list which are available to me as well as some others shows that in many of these cases the end of the manuscript is preserved and it is clear that it was never intended to contain the entire work. Most of Tanaka's 'incomplete' manuscripts are therefore probably complete in the sense that nothing has been lost, even though they do not contain the complete text of the PDhS.

This state of affairs, which at first sight might well seem curious, probably reflects the changing position of the PDhS in the curriculum of traditional studies. It agrees with the fact that, while the oldest three surviving commentaries on the work covered the entire text,[22] the two commentaries which belong to a (considerably) later period, the *Sūkti* of Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra and Padmanābha Miśra's *Setu*, only go up to the end of the section on substances. At what point this change in emphasis took place I cannot say,[23] but it is likely to reflect the loss of interest in 'old' Vaiśeṣika. The detailed discussions of especially the *guṇa* section of the

21 The Bodleian Library's MS Sansk. d. 171, described in M. Winternitz and A.B. Keith *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Vol. II* (Oxford 1905), p. 202b, no. 1331, as '*Dravyapadārtha*, a Vaiśeṣika work on the category dravya or substance,' is in fact, as the extract given there reveals, another manuscript of the *dravya* section of the PDhS. This seems to have been overlooked by the compilers of the NCC as well as by Tanaka. It is quite likely that some of the other manuscripts listed in the NCC s.v. *Dravyapadārtha* will also prove to contain the *dravya* section of the PDhS.

22 In the case of the *Kiraṇāvalī* it is I think safe to assume that Udayana's intention was to do this, though he was prevented, probably by death, from completing the work. At any rate his commentary is not confined to the *dravya* section.

23 The oldest dated manuscript of the *dravya* section alone that has been collected by Tanaka is his no. 20, from the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, with a date (*saṃvat* 1638) corresponding to A.D. 1581/1582 rather than A.D. 1580 as given by Tanaka (1994, xii). There are several which are less than half a century younger, e.g. his no. 12 and MS 5306 of the University of Kerala Manuscripts Library (not examined by Tanaka), which is dated *vikramasaṃvat* 1663, *śaka* 1528 (A.D. 1606/1607). Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra's floruit is placed at c. A.D. 1620 (cf. Potter 1983, 393) and that of Padmanābha Miśra at c. A.D. 1650 (cf. Potter 1983, 417), so it is evident that in treating the *dravya* section alone these scholars were following rather than initiating a trend.

PDhS must have been gradually superseded by the new ideas (and interests) of the 'new school' of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika; the *dravya* section with its more elementary nature apparently remained a popular item on the curriculum, and this inevitably had an important effect on the manuscript tradition of the text.

With so many manuscripts surviving of what clearly was a popular and much studied work throughout the whole of India[24] over a period of more than a millennium, it is no more than to be expected that the text should have been transmitted with a very large number of variants. Even though only a small proportion of the manuscripts has been collated as yet, it is already evident that this is indeed the case. The problems that the editor faces in dealing with this mass of variants need to be considered; but before that, attention should be given to sources which are admittedly 'secondary' but which nonetheless are of great importance.

2.2 The evidence of the commentaries

Marui has very rightly emphasized the importance of taking the evidence of the early commentaries on the PDhS into consideration, and has himself demonstrated their value in establishing the text. Bronkhorst and Ramseier are also aware of this, and in the preface to their work Bronkhorst has the following to say.

> A third feature that distinguishes this Word-index is the attempt that has been made to note readings recorded in the three oldest commentaries (Kiraṇāvalī, Nyāyakandalī, Vyomavatī) which deviate from editions *Ki.*, *Ny.* and *Vy.* respectively. Where our text does not refer to these commentaries in the footnotes, it may be assumed that either the reading recorded in the commentary concerned agrees with the corresponding edition, or that the commentary contains no clear indication as to what reading it accepts.
>
> The information provided with regard to the readings accepted in the commentaries has to be treated with the greatest care. It is rarely pos-

24 There are manuscripts of the PDhS in most of the major Indian scripts, though Devanāgarī and Bengali manuscripts predominate. Thirty-two of the fifty-two manuscrips collected and described by Tanaka are written in 'Nagari'*, fourteen in Bengali script, two in Śāradā script and one each in Maithili, Assamese, Grantha, Telugu scripts. There are also Malayalam manuscripts in existence, for instance a old palm-leaf manuscript of the complete text in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library (no. 34). So far I know of no manuscripts of the PDhS in Oriya or Kannada scripts.

* Tanaka does not distinguish between Jaina and non-Jaina Devanāgarī; several of the manuscripts he indiscriminately lables as 'Nagari' are in fact written in Jaina Devanāgarī and by Jain scribes. This includes the oldest dated manuscript known to either Tanaka or myself, no. 782 of 1875/76 in the BORI, dated *saṃvat* 1578 (A.D. 1521/1522), which is referred to occasionally in the following by the siglum J_1.

sible to reconstruct with certainty the exact reading of the original with the help of a commentary. Moreover, different mss. of one commentary do not always agree with each other, and may attribute different readings to the Praśastapādabhāṣya. Our notes in this respect are therefore tentative and provisional, and no more than that. (Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994, ix)

What Bronkhorst and Ramseier have done is very worth-while, and they are the first to try and do it for the whole text. It is something of a pity though that, as Bronkhorst says, when one finds no mention of the reading supported by a commentary in the notes, there are two possibilities: either the commentary supports the reading in the corresponding edition or it does not allow determination of the *mūla* reading followed. After all, the difference between the two is a significant one, especially where the editions do not agree. For this reason, a reader who wishes to pursue the textual problems of a given passage will still often have to determine the position of the commentators for himself.

The cautionary remarks that Bronkhorst makes are judicious ones. It may be useful to add something further to them here. It is true that the reconstruction of a *mūla* text from a commentary thereon is a very difficult and uncertain task, though there are a few cases in which it has been attempted with what may be hoped is a certain degree of success.[25] As far as I know there have been no studies of the general methodological problems involved. One should in my opinion try to distinguish between kinds or degrees of support for a reading in the *mūla*; the evidence of a *pratīka* quoted in the commentary I would call weak support, and other cases where a word appears in a particular form in the course of a discussion are also usually inconclusive, as it may not have been the commentator's intention to use precisely the same form he finds in the *mūla* text. It is in the case of this type of 'weak' evidence, especially that of *pratīkas*, that the problem Bronkhorst draws attention to, viz. that 'different mss... may attribute different readings' to a *mūla* seems most often to occur. A possible explanation for this is that when there is nothing in the commentary to ensure the reading and interpretation of a quoted passage a transmitter of the text may substitute a reading more familiar to him, whether from memory or from a manuscript of the *mūla*.

Negative evidence, that is to say absence of support, can be important and quite strong sometimes, especially in the case of elements of which there is already some other reason to suspect that they are inserted.

Certain kinds of commentatorial explanation can be reckoned as providing considerably stronger support than *pratīkas*. An example of what I would put in this

25 Most famously in the case of Mallavādin's *Dvādaśāranayacakra*, reconstructed by Muni Jambūvijaya from Siṃhasūri's commentary alone, in the absence of any manuscripts of the *mūla* text.

category may be taken from Marui's 1985 article. At an important point in the account of perception in the PDhS, a long compound listing the causes of perceptual knowledge of a substance is printed in most of the editions as *anekadravyavattvodbhūtarūpaprakāśacatuṣṭayasannikarṣāt*. Marui comments:

> However, a close look at the way each commentator paraphrased this portion would disclose that the word "*udbhūta*" was absent in the text known to them. Decisive are the explanations: "*rūpaṃ cātra rūpaviśeṣo vivakṣitaḥ*" (*Vy*.2); "*rūpasya prakāśa udbhavasamākhyāto rūpasya dharmaḥ*" (*Nk*.2); "*rūpaṃ codbhūtasvabhāvam*" (*Ki*.2). These comments would hardly be understandable if they had been intended for paraphrasing "*udbhūtarūpa*". Thus, the attestation of the commentators evidently supports...the wording which is recorded only in the long-neglected edition, L. (Marui 1985, 116)[26]

In cases such as this one, the chance that the text of the commentaries has been tampered with is considerably smaller, though it is perhaps necessary to be always aware of the possibility.

This example was one in which the commentaries unanimously support a particular reading. In his article Marui, as we saw above (p. 316), spoke of the possibility that different 'lineages' (i.e., presumably, recensions) of the PDhS existed already at the time of the commentators, though he remarked that 'without a thorough examination of all the MSS of *PBh*, one cannot possibly give a definite answer as to whether there existed different lines of transmission of *PBh* at all' (Marui 1985, 111). This seems to be unnecessarily cautious, and Bronkhorst and Ramseier have in their notes drawn attention to some cases where the commentaries support different readings, though usually without specifying the nature of the support.[27] This

26 In 1990, before I was aware of Marui's article, I arrived at substantially the same conclusions (Isaacson 1990, 64–65). Preisendanz too went over the same ground independently, in a paper presented at the panel on early Vaiśeṣika in the 34th ICANAS, Hong Kong, August 1993. In Isaacson 1994, 153 n. 25 I observed that the manuscript tradition of the PDhS, as far as I had studied it up to that point, also supports the same reading that the commentators must have had. The most thorough discussion of the entire problem of the introduction of the concept of *udbhūtarūpa* in the Vaiśeṣika will be found in Preisendanz 1995.
Somewhat surprisingly, in view of Bronkhorst's statements quoted on p. 325 above, the notes to the Bronkhorst/Ramseier edition contain no comment on the fact that the commentators clearly had a different reading from the PDhS text together with which they are printed.

27 Though they do not discuss the general question of different kinds or levels of support, Bronkhorst and Ramseier are clearly aware of it, at some places indicating uncertainty by a formulation using words such as 'probably' (e.g. p. 1 n.8) or 'appears to' (e.g. p. 4 n.11), or by adding '(?)' (e.g. p. 26 n.8). At a few places they quote the relevant words from the commentary (e.g. p. 14 n.9).

is by no means a rare occurrence,[28] and it may be worth giving a few illustrations, to which attention has not been drawn before, of support being found for different readings in different commentaries.[29]

1. In the opening section of the PDhS a brief review of the six categories is given, in which the ultimate individuators are thus described: *nityadravya-vṛttayo 'ntyā viśeṣāḥ | te khalv atyantavyāvṛttihetutvād viśeṣā eva* (text as in Dvivedin's edition, 13.20–21). For the words *te khalv atyantavyāvṛttihetutvād* Bronkhorst and Ramseier (p. 2, § 8) report two variants in the published edition: *te ca khalv atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvād* and *te khalv atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvād*.[30] The commentaries have the following to say.

   Vyomaśiva: ***te ca*** *viśeṣā viśeṣayanti vyāvartayanti svāśrayam āśrayāntarād iti | parīkṣārtham āha—****te cātyantaṃ*** *sarvadā* ***vyāvṛttibuddher*** *eva* ***hetutvād*** *viśeṣā eva | na sāmānyam apīti* (Vyo² vol. 1 24.25–26). This supports *te ca*, and not a following *khalu*, but not very strongly, as this type of evidence is relatively easy to tamper with. The support for *atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvāt* is stronger though.

   Śrīdhara: ***te khalv*** *iti |* ***khalu****śabdo niścaye | nityadravyavṛttayo ye viśeṣās te viśeṣā eva niścitā, na tu sāmānyāny api bhavantīty arthaḥ |* ***atyantam*** *sarvadā* ***vyāvṛtter*** *eva svāśrayasyetarasmād vyavacchedasyaiva* ***hetutvāt*** *kāraṇatvād iti* (NK² 47.5–7, NK¹ 14.3–5). This provides strong support for reading *khalu* in the text and almost as strong support, I should say, for doing so without a preceding *ca*, together with strong support for *atyantavyāvṛtti-hetutvāt*, with no °*buddhi*°. Interestingly, the °*buddhi*° is universally attested in the manuscripts I have seen; one manuscript I have collated (no. 8880 of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta [= Tanaka's no. 4]) has °*buddher* instead, but I have not yet found one which omits the word altogether.

   Udayana: *nanu tathāpi sāmānyāny eva kānicit tathā bhaviṣyanti, guṇā vā, kiṃ padārthāntarakalpanayā, ity ata āha—****te ceti*** *|* ***cas*** *tvarthaḥ | ayam arthaḥ—te punar yady ekaikavṛttayaḥ kathaṃ sāmānyarūpāḥ, anekavyakti-vṛttitve ca katham* ***antyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetavaḥ*** *| guṇā api bhavantaḥ sāmānyavantaḥ syuḥ, tathāpy* ***atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvaṃ*** *vyāhanyeta |*

28 The instances which may be found from the notes in Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994 are not all that could be gleaned by a careful reading of the commentaries.

29 I have deliberately tried to choose examples, both here and elsewhere in this appendix, which are simple and do not affect the philosophical content of the text to too great an extent. This is because I wish to focus attention on the methodological problems at stake and intend to avoid being led away into the discussion of philosophical points. It is for this reason that most examples come from the *dravya* section.

30 For our purpose it is unimportant to note which editions have what reading.

ato niḥsāmānyāḥ, tathā ca guṇatvavyāghātaḥ | *tasmād*[31] *antyavyapadeśād* ***atyantavyāvṛttibuddher*** *eva* ***hetutvād*** *viśeṣā eva viśeṣāḥ, nānyatrāntarbhūtā iti*[32] (KĀ 17.14–19). This is strong support for *te ca* and *atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvāt*, and the absence of comment on *khalu* looks significant again.

This is not the place to discuss what reading is most likely to be what Praśastapāda wrote;[33] it is enough to have demonstrated that the commentaries do not unanimously support a particular reading.

2. In the section on water, at PDhS 36.5–7 Dvivedin prints *indriyaṃ sarvaprāṇināṃ rasavyañjakaṃ vijātyanabhibhūtair jalāvayavair ārabdhaṃ rasanam*. Here I want to draw attention only to the word *vijātyanabhibhūtaiḥ*.[34]

   Vyomaśiva: *atha kasmāt kiṃcid evāpyaṃ dravyaṃ rūpādiṣu madhye niyamena rasavyañjakam indriyaṃ cety āha—****anyāvayavānabhibhūtair*** *īṣatsampṛktair api jalāvayavair ārabdhaṃ rasanam iti rasasyaiva vyañjakam iti* | *anye tu* ***anyāvayavānabhibhūtair*** *asampṛktaiḥ śuddhair jalāvayavair ārabdham iti bruvate* (Vyo² vol. 1 82.16–19). This gives us multiple weak support for *anyāvayavānabhibhūtaiḥ*, a reading attested in some editions but only very sporadically in the manuscript tradition.[35]

   Śrīdhara: *tathāpi kasmāt tad eva rasavyañjakaṃ syāt, nānyad udakadravyam ity āha—****vijātyanabhibhūtair*** *iti* | ***vijātibhiḥ*** *pārthivāvayavair ye 'nabhibhūtā apratihatasāmarthyā āpyāvayavais tair itaradravyavilakṣaṇam ārabdham* (NK² 113.2–4, NK¹ 38.15–18). There is rather stronger support here for *vijātyanabhibhūtaiḥ*.

   Udayana: ***anyāvayavānabhibhūtair*** *iti* | *vātādyabhibhave jaḍajihvātvād iti bhāvaḥ*. Weak support for the same reading Vyomaśiva probably had.

Aside from the question of distinguishing between relatively weak and relatively strong support for a given reading, one must in using the commentaries at least be aware of the fact that they themselves are not available in critical editions and present their own textual problems in many places. Despite this, their evidence can

31 *tasmād*: em., *tasyād* Jetly

32 From the conclusion here it appears that Udayana *may* have read *viśeṣā eva viśeṣāḥ* instead of *viśeṣā eva*, a variant attested in one edition of the PDhS.

33 Such a discussion would also have to take several related passages in the PDhS into account.

34 For a discussion of the wording of the first part of the sentence see p. 331 below.

35 Out of twenty-three manuscripts I examined for this portion of the text a single one (Oriental Institute, Baroda, Acc. No. 8169, a very corrupt manuscript in Jaina Devanāgarī) reads thus. The Malayalam manuscript I have collated (cf. footnote 24 on p. 325 above) reads *anyāvayavāsametair*, but is the only source known to me to do so.

be of great value, as Marui and Preisendanz have shown, and may shed light on historical developments in the Vaiśeṣika. Vyomaśiva's commentary, the *Vyomavatī*, is preserved in a manuscript in Mysore which bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1389,[36] which is most probably older than any of the manuscripts of the PDhS that Tanaka or I have been able to examine and which should be regarded as being among the most important witnesses to the text of the PDhS, particularly in those places where the commentary gives 'strong' support to a reading. A critical edition of the *Vyomavatī* would be a very valuable thing, and it could be argued that this ought by rights to precede or accompany an attempt to critically edit the PDhS.[37]

In view of the fact which we have noted, that the different commentaries at places had clearly divergent texts of the PDhS before them, it would be an interesting task to try and determine whether any particular surviving manuscript or group of manuscripts is closely related to the text of one of the commentators. Several of the early editors noticed that the manuscripts of the PDhS that they used did not agree fully with the text of a commentary (cf. Marui 1985, 110–111). As far as I can say, it is Tanaka who has for the first time suggested a specific correspondence, though without as yet arguing in detail for it. Speaking of $Ś_1$ he says:

> The readings of our *śāradā* manuscript are relatively similar to the readings of VizSS [i.e. the Dvivedin edition of the PDhS together with the *Nyāyakandalī*]. And the different readings found in *śāradā* manuscript are attested to with the readings cited in the NK. It seems that the manuscripts of the PDhS may have different recensions in its textual origin. And our manuscript seems to belong to one recension on which NK. [i.e. the *Nyāyakandalī*] is based. (KV. [i.e. the *Kiraṇāvalī*] might be based on the another recension of the PDhS.) (Tanaka 1994, vi)

If correct, this correspondence between $Ś_1$ and the *Nyāyakandalī* would be very interesting and significant, though the possibility should be born in mind that the

36 See the description of the manuscript in Slaje 1983, 24–26. In this dissertation, unfortunately unpublished (I am indebted to Dr. Slaje for kindly providing me with a copy). Slaje was the first scholar to make use of the manuscript in studying the text of the *Vyomavatī*. He has been followed most notably by Halbfass, who translated a small section from Vyomaśiva's commentary (1992, 246–255). Halbfass remarks that the manuscript 'solves numerous problems and is generally of great help for a better understanding of the *Vyomavatī*' (1992, 247), and gives a list of twenty-one corrections for four pages of text of Gaurinath Shastri's edition, most of them based on the manuscript reading, commenting in a footnote (no. 31 on p. 265) that '[t]his illustrates that there is still need for a critical edition of this important text.'

37 Of course this situation, a type of *cakraka*, is one which one encounters almost at every turn in studying ancient Indian texts, and it may be more realistic to say that the important thing is that the circle should be broken, no matter where.

manuscript has been influenced by Śrīdhara's commentary rather than being an independent descendent of the manuscript Śrīdhara used. But I am not convinced that Tanaka is right in his observation in the first place, for there are numerous passages I have noticed where the manuscript has a reading which, while possible and attested elsewhere, is almost certainly not what Śrīdhara comments on. Three examples:

1. At the equivalent of PDhS 28.10–11 (Tanaka's sentence 76) Ś₁ has *sthāvarās tṛṇoṣadhigulmalatāvatānavanaspataya iti* (f. 3v12).[38] The long compound here is one for which we find a large number of variant readings. The reading in Ś₁ is relatively poorly attested, but is found also in Ś₂ and no. 396 of 1875/76 in the BORI, a Kashmiri Devanāgarī manuscript which is very closely related to Ś₁ throughout. Śrīdhara probably had the reading *tṛṇauṣadhivṛkṣagulmalatāvatānavanaspataya(ḥ)*, for his commentary reads ***tṛṇam** upalādiḥ, **auṣadhayaḥ** phalapākāntā godhūmādayaḥ, ye sapuṣpaphalās te **vṛkṣāḥ** kovidāraprabhṛtayaḥ, **gulmāḥ** sastūpā vaṃśekṣuprabhṛtayaḥ,*[39] ***latā** prasiddhaiva, avatanvantīty*[40] ***avatānā***[41] *viṭapāḥ ketakībījapūrādayaḥ, ye vinā puṣpaṃ phalanti te **vanaspataya** udumbarādayaḥ* (NK² 106.11–107, NK¹ 35.16–19) The reading Śrīdhara seems to have followed is found in a fairly large group of manuscripts, including the oldest dated one, J₁ (cf. footnote 24 on p. 325 above). It is also supported by Vyomaśiva's commentary.

2. PDhS 36.5–6 (Tanaka's 'sentence' 87) reads in Ś₁ *indriyaṃ sarvaprāṇināṃ rasopalambhakaṃ* (f. 4r3). This is also the reading of quite a number of other manuscripts. The *Nyāyakandalī* however suggests *rasavyañjakaṃ sarvaprāṇinām* instead of *sarvaprāṇināṃ rasopalambhakam*, though only with (multiple) 'weak' support: *indriyaṃ rasavyañjakaṃ sarvaprāṇinām iti | sarvaprāṇināṃ rasavyañjakaṃ yad indriyaṃ tajjalāvayavair ārabdham | tathāpi kasmāt tad eva rasavyañjakaṃ syāt...* NK² 113.1–2, NK¹ 38.14–16.

38 This folio not being reproduced in Tanaka 1987, I rely on the transcriptions in Tanaka's articles of 1987 and 1991.

39 The words *gulmāḥ sastūpā vaṃśekṣuprabhṛtayaḥ* are omitted in Dvivedin's edition of the *Nyāyakandalī*. This may be an editorial lapse, or it may reflect the manuscripts, and in the latter case it may be a purely scribal variant or this may be a case where the commentary has been tampered with to support another reading. In general Jetly's manuscript material seems to be superior to that used by Dvivedin, so I prefer to accept his reading at present. If the Dvivedin reading should be original, Śrīdhara presumably read *tṛṇauṣadhivṛkṣalatāvatānavanaspataya(ḥ)*, still disagreeing with what we find in Ś₁.

40 Thus Dvivedin's edition. The *avatanvantīsaty* in Jetly's text must be a printing error.

41 After this Dvivedin's edition adds *nāma*, which is not found in the three *Nyāyakandalī* manuscripts used by Jetly.

3. At PDhS 69.10–11 (Tanaka's sentence 181, Bronkhorst and Ramseier's § 77) the large majority of sources that I am aware of read *na śarīrendriyamanasām, ajñatvāt.* A minority however, including both the birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts, adds *caitanyam* before *ajñatvāt.* Bronkhorst and Ramseier (p. 15 n. 1) have correctly observed that the *Kiraṇāvalī* and the *Nyāyakandalī* confirm the *lectio difficilior*[42] which omits the subject: Śrīdhara writing *na śarīrendriyamanasām iti | uttaravākyasthitaṃ caitanyam iti padam iha sambadhyate* (NK[2] 179.10–11, NK[1] 72.6), and Udayana having *na śarīrendriyamanasām | caitanyam agre vakṣyatīti*[43] (KĀ 86.9–10). Vyomaśiva's commentary is the only one which is reasonably consistent with reading *caitanyam* here.

Such cases lead me to believe that Tanaka overstates the relationship between Ś₁ and the *Nyāyakandalī.* Nonetheless, the idea is good, and it is certainly worth continuing to try and identify a close correspondence between a manuscript and the text followed by a particular commentator.

2.3 Other testimonia

In addition to the evidence provided by commentaries, other testimonia may also be of use in constituting the text, and should at any rate be collected and taken seriously into consideration. When quotations from the PDhS are found in relatively old works, we may have an independent transmission of some passages at least that goes back to a source earlier than the oldest manuscripts that are now available. Such citations may be particularly interesting if they also provide comments on the quoted passage that allow the wording to be checked to some extent at least.

A serious attempt to collect all citations of the PDhS will require extensive reading, and therefore access to a first-rate library of Sanskrit texts. From my own desultory explorations it has become clear that the work is quoted a very large number of times and in literature of surprising diversity. It is natural that many of these quotations are found in philosophical works, of the Vaiśeṣika and of e.g. the Buddhists and the Jains. More surprising is that the PDhS is cited even in works of quite

42 The sentence is printed in italics by Bronkhorst and Ramseier, indicating use of the 'vārttika style.'

43 Jetly reports a variant (from an earlier edition) *caitanyam ity agre bhaviṣyati* for *caitanyam agre vakṣyatīti*; this looks incidentally like a slightly more explicit and therefore probably secondary reading.

different genres, such as Śaiva theology,[44] *alaṃkāraśāstra*[45] and commentaries on classical poetry.[46]

3 The editorial problem

The situation with which a prospective editor of the PDhS is confronted is one which is by no means an exceptional one, but it presents difficulties which have no easy solution. We have, to sum up, a text which undoubtedly goes back to a single author but which has been transmitted over a long period and survives in a large number of manuscripts, the oldest of which are separated from the time of composition by nearly a millennium, and which vary to a large degree. We may be certain that the extant manuscripts, numerous though they are, form but a small fraction of the total number of written records of the work that have existed since its composition. Furthermore, as of the present, even of the extant manuscripts the large majority has not been collated. There are sources (particularly the commentaries) which may allow glimpses of states of the text pre-dating all our manuscripts, but these are incomplete, conflicting and perhaps not always reliable.

In view of the fact that only a small proportion of the manuscripts is available to me, it would be premature to put forth here elaborate theories as to their mutual relationship. Nonetheless, on the basis of the limited amount of information now at my disposal, I predict that the construction of a stemma, i.e. of a hypothesis as to the relationship of the manuscripts with an acceptable degree of plausibility, will prove to be a very difficult task. This is not merely because of the complexity of the taxonomy of so great a number of different textual states, but because I believe that conflation has played large enough a role that it will only be in the case of perhaps a few groups of clearly related manuscripts that the evidence will be consistent enough to allow classical methods of textual analysis to be applied with a degree of succes.[47]

44 Kumāradeva (second half of the 11th century) quotes the *praśastapādīyaṃ vaiśeṣikabhāṣyam* in his *Tātparyadīpikā* on Bhoja's *Tattvaprakāśa*; see Vrajavallabha Dvivedī (ed.), *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, Varanasi 1988 (Yogatantra-granthamālā vol. 12), 91.16–17. Intriguingly, Abhinavagupta refers in his *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa* (57.4–5) to a work of his, now lost, which, from its title, *Padārthapraveśanirṇayaṭīkā*, could conceivably be a commentary on the PDhS.

45 Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, the largest classical *alaṃkāraśāstra* textbook, quotes from the PDhS, referring to Praśastapāda by name, and his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (again the *alaṃkāraśāstra* work, not the grammatical one of the same name) also quotes from the PDhS. See Raghavan 1963, 757 for a collection of the relevant passages.

46 Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita's commentary on the *Naiṣadhacarita*, written in A.D. 1297 (cf. Handiqui 1965, xviii), quotes from the PDhS in explaining verse 19.52 of the poem. See the extract given by Handiqui (1965, 486); regrettably this important commentary remains unpublished save for the fragments quoted in Handiqui's notes to his translation of the *Naiṣadhacarita*.

47 The method developed by Dearing (1983 [first published 1959]) to determine the relationship of

There are several reasons to believe the level of contamination to be high. The situation appears to be very comparable to that which Srinivasan discovered and described with regard to Vācaspati Miśra's *Tattvakaumudī*. The number of manuscripts of that text is comparable with that of the PDhS, though it is rather larger, and like the PDhS it is a work that has been studied intensively, commented on, and copied over the length and breadth of India. Srinivasan came to the conclusion, which seems convincing enough on the basis of the evidence given, that genetic relationships between his manuscripts could not be established.[48] He even raises the question whether the *Tattvakaumudī* ever was transmitted in purely vertical lines of descent.

Furthermore, a number of the manuscripts of the PDhS show clear signs of the process of contamination; i.e., like many of Srinivasan's manuscripts, they contain corrections that strongly suggest that more than one exemplar was used in producing the state of the text that ultimately resulted. We have seen examples of this in the BORI birch-bark manuscript in Śāradā script (cf. p. 318 above), which though undated is probably among the oldest manuscripts we have.[49] That was a case of 'correctional conflation,' to use the term coined by Greg (1927, 56), and there are several others known to me. There is also at least one manuscript which is patently an instance of 'editorial conflation,'[50] with variant readings given in marginal notes by the original scribe, and there may well be others which do not obviously betray

textual states when dealing with conflation is not only very impractical if the number of sources is large but is also methodologically somewhat dubious, although it is possible that further refinement may render it applicable in some cases at least. Cf. in particular the review of Dearing's 1974 book (a revised version of Dearing 1983 [first published 1959] which is not available to me at present) by Weitzman (1977); Dearing's response (1979) is not convincing in all respects: note his remark 'I believe that chance is likely to be a negligible cause of agreement between texts *as long as it is reasonably clear that the texts were intended to be as much like their exemplars as possible*' (p. 357, my emphasis). This stipulation is one which is only fulfilled in very exceptional cases, in my opinion. For another convincing criticism of a crucial part of Dearing's method see Salemans 1990, especially p. 456–458.

48 'In unserem Material ist aber Kontamination. . . in dem Maße gegeben, daß in ihm keine Überlieferungslinien zu erkennen sein. D.h. es kommt unter unseren Handschriften und Drucken nicht zur Bildung fester genetischer Gruppen, Gruppen also, denen jeweils eine an der Gesamtmenge des Sekundären gemessen große Anzahl von solchen Unursprünglichkeiten gemeinsam wäre, die höchst wahrscheinlich nur einmal aufgekommen sind' Srinivasan 1967, 6.

49 Tanaka, writing of the two birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts, thinks that '[a]lthough it is impossible to tell exactly when these manuscripts were made, it is sure that they are the oldest of the manuscripts that I have collected' (1991, 1). I think it may be true that they are the oldest ones, but his confidence is too great: it is very difficult to date manuscripts in Śāradā script, and I have seen birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts of other texts bearing dates in the seventeenth century which are very similar to the two PDhS ones.

50 A manuscript on paper and in Śāradā script in the manuscript collection of the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, no. 4631. The manuscript has apparently not been collected by Tanaka.

the fact that their text has been composed in a similar way.

There is every reason to suppose that the process of conflation has been going on for a very long time indeed. It may not necessarily have taken place on an extremely large scale; it is quite possible that more than fifty percent, say, of the manuscripts of the PDhS were copied from a single source and never compared and collated against another, but I have no doubt that the level is significant enough to render it very difficult to establish genetic relationships between the manuscripts.[51] Nor is it only these reflections that have caused me to be thus convinced; various attempts on my part to work out a 'stemma' of the manuscripts available to me have confirmed this to my own satisfaction at least.

Here it might perhaps be asked if some of the difficulties could not be avoided by taking into consideration only the manuscripts which contain the entire text of the PDhS, thus reducing the number of sources to be considered by well over fifty percent (cf. p. 324 above). If it is true that in the last five centuries or so interest in the complete text diminished appreciably, one might expect that the complete manuscripts would in general be older, more reliable and perhaps less conflated—aside from the fact that the reduction in number would make the purely mathematical side of the analysis less complex.

This suggestion seems to me one which has some practical advantages to recommend it. However it does not by any means nullify the problem of contamination. It will be remembered that it was in a manuscript of the complete text, and an old one at that, that we saw signs of correctional conflation. It is also doubtful whether we have any manuscripts that really date from the period before transmission of the *dravya* section alone became widespread. If we do not, there is an additional factor that makes conflation more likely: anyone who did want to have a complete text of the PDhS, but had a manuscript of the *dravya* section alone, would very probably try to find a complete manuscript and if he produced a new copy would be prone to conflate the two. That this happened indeed is strongly suggested by, again, the BORI Śāradā manuscript when it is compared with $Ś_1$, for Tanaka remarks, without calling attention to or perhaps even realizing the implications, that 'in this *Dravya-prakaraṇa* there are few differences between the two manuscripts, and it can be said that they are complements of each other. But we can detect a great many variants in the *Guṇa-prakaraṇa* and elsewhere' (Tanaka 1991, 2).[52]

51 Cf. e.g. West's remark 'If contamination is present in more than a slight degree, it will be found that no stemmatic hypothesis is satisfactory' (1973, 36).

52 This should also warn us that classification of the manuscripts into groups by script is a dangerous thing. It is doubtful whether we should speak of 'the textual tradition of the *PDS* in *śāradā* (Tanaka 1991, 1), as if the Śāradā manuscripts formed a clearly defined group or recension. In fact they do not. In addition to the two Śāradā manuscripts transcribed by Tanaka I have looked at a Śāradā manuscript in Ujjain (cf. footnote 50 above) and a birch-bark Śāradā manuscript of

To turn now from these perhaps discouraging reflections, we should again recall that there is nothing out of the ordinary in these problems; editors of for instance medieval European texts have been trying to cope with similar and greater difficulties for more than a century. It should be possible to learn from the experience of such scholars at least what lines of approach come into consideration.[53] There are various possible courses for a would-be editor of our text, each with different merits and disadvantages.

First one could mention the possibility of a 'stemmatic' attempt at a critical edition, one which attempts to determine the relationship between the manuscripts and on that basis evaluate the strength of individual readings. After what has just been said it may be surprising that this option is mentioned here, but it is one which I do not think should be ruled out yet. Even in the case of seriously contaminated traditions the problem of stemmatic analysis may not be as hopeless as it is usually thought to be. The method proposed by Dearing admittedly has serious drawbacks (cf. footnote 47 on p. 334 above), but refinements are possible, and several scholars,

the *dravya* section alone in the British Museum (not mentioned by Tanaka), and am convinced that there is no unified 'Śāradā recension.' The only case I see of manuscripts in a particular script seeming to be close enough that it might be possible to group them together is that of the Bengali manuscripts I have examined. However, as I have only collated five, it is quite likely that several of the other manuscripts in Bengali script will not confirm this picture. Compare also the findings of Srinivasan, who found his Grantha, Malayalam, Oriya, Śāradā and Bengali manuscripts to be as contaminated as the Devanāgarī ones (1967, 5). For the text-criticism of the *Mahābhārata* too the classification of manuscripts into recensions chiefly according to script by the editors of the critical edition is highly problematic: cf. Grünendahl 1993, which also makes general (critical) observations on what Grünendahl calls the 'Schriftartprämisse.'

53 Here it may be permissable to observe that standards of awareness of text-critical problems and methodology among editors of Sanskrit texts seem to be almost distressingly low. If editors refer at all to theoretical studies of these problems, it is often merely to Maas' famous essay on 'Textkritik,' an admittedly important work but one which represents only one particular school of thought, which is no longer dominant among textual editing in most fields. Tanselle has made some cogent remarks which apply with full force to nearly all editors of classical Indian texts.

> By not familiarizing themselves with the textual criticism of classical, biblical, and medieval literature, textual scholars of more recent literature are cutting themselves off from a voluminous body of theoretical discussion and the product of many generations of experience. And by not keeping up with developments in the editing of post-medieval writings, students of earlier works are depriving themselves of the knowledge of significant advances in editorial thinking. (Tanselle 1990, 275)

Srinivasan's work is one of the rare exceptions to this rather blinkered tendency, though as far as I can see he does not make any reference to Dearing's work, which would have been of some relevance to the problems he deals with. Hisashi Matsumura, in a brief article 'On Editing Indian Codices Multi,' in *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 3 (1986), 93–100, also pleads for awareness by Indologists and Buddhologists of 'ideas and methods in researching in related disciplines' (p. 100), referring particularly to classical, medieval and Biblical studies, though his citations of work by medievalists are somewhat one-sided and outdated.

driven by necessity or interest, have in the last few years attacked the problem with admirable vigour.[54] It may be worth trying to apply the results of their experience to the transmission of the PDhS and, to borrow Shackelton Bailey's phrase (1976, 27), turn the mob of manuscripts into a family. Such an attempt can best wait, however, till all the manuscripts that can possibly be found have been collated; as even Dearing admits, in a conflated tradition the absence or presence of witnesses can have important consequences on the picture of the relationships.[55]

Another approach would be to give up the endeavour to recover exactly what Praśastapāda wrote. One could instead try to reconstruct the text as known to a particular commentator, a version which is almost certainly not identical in all respects to the original but of which we know that it had currency and, at least through the commentary, importance at a particular time. For this, since the commentaries do not allow us to determine their readings at all places, it would be necessary to identify manuscripts which seem to be very close to the recension followed by one of

54 Using a mainly theoretical approach, with simulated data, Flight claims to 'have shown that complicated—"open"—traditions are not impossssible to penetrate by means of stemmatic analysis. In theory, under certain conditions, we can still succeed in disentangling the relationships among the surviving manuscripts' (1992, 49). He is well aware that it remains to be seen whether things will work this way in practice: 'To reach this result, we have worked with imaginary data in which there is guarenteed to be a perfect match between the patterns of agreement permitted by the stemma and the patterns of distribution exemplified by the variants. It goes without saying that in real traditions we do not expect this guarentee to hold. In other words, we expect the distribution of some variants not to accord with any of the patterns allowed by the original stemma. These variants are the noise in the data. The question we are left with is this: how and how far can we filter out such noise, by taking advantage of any redundancy in the original message? Until we can answer this question, the integration of theory and practice will not have been achieved' (op. cit. loc. cit). What Flight refers to as 'noise' is of course essentially the same as the phenomenon of accidental convergence; if anything a more serious threat to the legitimacy of the stemmatic approach than conflation is.
Another interesting contribution, the value of which I have not yet been able to fully assess, is made by Mulken, in her 1993 dissertation on *The manuscript tradition of the Perceval of Chrétian de Troyes*, subtitled *A stemmatological and dialectological approach*, in which she claims to have been succesful in uncovering the complex network of relationships between the manuscripts of this notoriously conflated tradition, using methods developed by Dees.

55 'The recovery or creation of additional manuscripts will only fill in or extend a bibliographic scheme: however, if conflation is present, the recovery or creation of additional states may require the alteration of a textual scheme. Since textual continuity results from the regular shift of likenesses and differences from one state to the next, conflicting chains of likeness and difference brought about by conflation force the choice of the simplest of several possibilities. Then the appearance of additional states may shift the balance in favor of a possibility previously rejected. This is a peculiarity of conceptual schemes of all kinds and does not affect their validity' (Dearing 1983, 6–7). While this fact may not affect the validity of the method, as Dearing says, it is an important limitation which in practice must be recognized and reckoned with by basing the reconstruction on all available sources.

the commentators, something which has not yet been successfully done (cf. p. 330ff. above). It would also be advisable to do this together with a critical edition of the relevant commentary itself.[56]

Finally, it would be possible to choose for a procedure in which the manuscript evidence would be collected and reported as thoroughly as possible, but in which stemmatic considerations would play no role; in other words, acceptance of a particular reading would be in principle independent of the number and identity of the manuscripts that bear witness to it. Such a method is essentially what Srinivasan followed in a comparable situation; see his description and illustration of the principles he has tried to follow on pp. 29–53. The chief among these, which underlies almost all the others, is the rule expressed in these words: 'Bei uneinheitlicher Überlieferung wurde diejenige Lesung als primär bewertet, auf die sich genetisch alle zurückführen lassen' (1967, 29). This general idea, of which the principle *lectio difficilior potior* may be said to be a special case, is a valid and powerful one, which indeed does at many places allow one to arrive at a fairly convincing solution. Many variants remain, however, between which it does not allow a definite decision.[57] As we have to do, however, with a text that may be attributed in its original form to an individual author, it is possible that a deep study of the work and its myriad transmitted states will enable an editor to familiarize himself so thoroughly with the *usus auctori* as well as the *usus scribendi* that a justifiable choice can be made even in such difficult cases.[58] It is more or less this tactic that I tried in preparing a preliminary edition of a portion of the text (cf. p. 322 above).

Whichever approach an editor chooses for, it is certain that his reconstruction of the PDhS can never be more than a single hypothesis. This does not render the attempt fruitless, though, and if carried out carefully by a scholar familiar with the material such a reconstruction may be of use to others and of value for the study of Indian philosophy and its historical development. It is perhaps conceivable that

56 In view of the character of our text and its transmission another possibility, to use some form of the 'best-text' method popular among many medievalists, does not come into serious consideration, in my view. A kind of modified best-text method has been proposed for the edition of the *Skandapurāṇa* (cf. Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1994), but there we have a manuscript that is separated from the original by much less time, perhaps two centuries or so, and which is clearly superior to the other witnesses. Moreover the text itself is one which was probably always much more fluid than the PDhS.

57 'In den voraufgehenden Erörterungen war die Unterscheidung primär:sekundär möglich, weil durchweg intentionale oder mechanische zur Variantenbildung führende Momente erkennbar waren. Nich selten lassen sich aber keine solchen Momente erkennen: dann ist der konstituierte Text ungesichert' (Srinivasan 1967, 44).

58 It is perhaps Kane who has done most to develop and illustrate this type of 'deep editing,' especially through his famous edition, together with Donaldson, of the B-text of *Piers Plowman* (London 1975).

the construction of stemmas may one day become a labour which can be carried out largely mechanically, by rule, i.e. by computer. The same is certainly not true of the establishing of a critical text; that will always remain an activity requiring human decision, and the value of the result will depend in large measure on the clarity and lack of prejudice of the editor's judgment.

APPENDIX 4

REFERENCES IN BHAṬṬA VĀDĪNDRA'S WRITINGS

A list of authors and works referred to by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was given by Thakur, on the last two pages of his 1960 article on our author. The motivation for compiling such a list afresh is two-fold. Firstly, Thakur left out or overlooked a large number of references,[1] while others which he gives contain errors. Secondly, the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary, the *Tarkasāgara*, can now be referred to in a form which should be fairly easily available—the edition by Thakur—rather than, as Thakur in 1960 did, by references to the folio numbers in the Mithila Institute transcripts.[2]

The present list too may well suffer from omissions and errors, aside from inaccuracies which are unavoidable in view of the often poor quality of the edited texts. The edition of the commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* (GKṬ) and the edition of the *Tarkasāgara* (TS) both lack any indices. Though both frequently print personal names and titles of works in bold-face, they are by no means consistent in doing so.

In compiling this list I have had to make various decisions which were far from clear-cut—particularly in drawing the line of what to include and what to leave out. In brief, I have made the following choices, sometimes arbitrarily perhaps.[3] The main principle was that the list should make it possible to find all cases where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra refers by name to an author, a school or sub-school of thought, or to a text. In this I include—as Thakur evidently did not—cases of self-reference and

1 If I have not miscounted, Thakur gives a total of 226 references under 80 entries while the list below contains 1185 references under 153 entries. This discrepancy is partly due, however, to different policies on what to incorporate in such a list; cf. below.

2 A further, more trivial, difference between the list given here and Thakur's, is that the latter is ordered according to the Roman alphabet, whereas this one follows the normal order for Sanskrit names and words.

3 Undoubtably everyone who has attempted to make such an index or list must have been confronted with the same or similar decisions, but in the cases I am familiar with at least, nothing is explicitly said about this matter, and in using such tools one is forced to discover experimentally what principles were followed.

those where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions a patron by name. Two items only which Thakur chooses to list have I left out; these are *īśvara*[4] (other designations for God have also not been included), and *sugata*; the latter because I was unable to find the word, which according to Thakur occurs once in the Mithila transcripts of the *Tarkasāgara*, in the edition.

But this by no means covers all of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's references. To widen the net, I have also listed the places where he alludes to authors or works by an epithet, thus including also entries such as *kevalānvayiprāmāṇyavādin* or *yogaśāstra*. As the last example illustrates, not only references to individual works are included but in addition such as may rather be to a genre or class of texts; thus *itihāsa* and *buddhāgama* are also found in the list.

The concept of a reference to a text has been stretched a little to include occurrences of the word *sūtra* (most usually referring to part of the VS) and references to *adhyāya*s and *āhnika*s of the VS; thus an entry will also be found for e.g. *navamādhyāya*.[5] Somewhat inconsistently, no doubt, I have not also indexed occurrences of the word *prakaraṇa*, with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra also occasionally refers to a particular section of the VS.

Finally, I have also decided to list cases where thinkers are referred to merely by certain pronouns, considering it unsatisfactory not to enable users also to find the places where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions, for instance, an opposing view or interpretation which is introduced merely with *anye tu* or *kecit*. Aside from these two,[6] the pronouns taken up in the list are *anya*, *apara*, *asmat*,[7] *para* and *bhavat*. It should be noted that occurrences of these are only listed when they are not accompanied by a further designation; thus in such a case as *ity apare sampradāyavidaḥ* (DKṬ 655.3–4) an entry is made only under *sampradāyavid*. I have drawn the line at also indexing the relative and correlative (demonstrative) pronouns, even though in some cases a group of thinkers may be only referred to with these, as in constructions such as *ye tu vyañjakatvānupapattāv iti hetuviśeṣaṇam āhuḥ, teṣāṃ vyarthaviśeṣa-*

4 Which occurs rather more frequently than the two text-references given by Thakur suggest; I have noted the word at more than a hundred places in our corpus.

5 In the case of entries of the last type, references to *adhyāya*s of the VS, all references are given under the compound form, for instance *navamādhyāya*, even if the text actually has, say, *navame 'dhyāye* or simply *navame*.

6 It has of course been necessary to distinguish between usages, especially of *kaścit* and inflected forms thereof. Only in cases where one may presume that proponents of some particular view are meant has the occurrence been noted.

7 The cases of usage of the first person pronoun have been arranged under this entry because almost all are formed from the plural base. The few exceptions (occurrences of e.g. *mayā*) are indicated as such. Note that usages such as *asmadādipratyakṣa* have not been included here; only when the first person is used to distinguish the view of one party of thinkers from another has it been indexed.

ṇatvam (GKṬ 48.17–19). One could of course try to find and include all of these, but one would still have a problem with cases where a particular standpoint is referred to merely by the use of a finite verb-form such as *manyase* or *āhuḥ*. In short, I feel this to belong rather to a (complete or selected) word-index, a further tool which would certainly be of immense value but the compilation of which would require a vast investment of time and effort.[8]

A companion index to this one, in which the quotations from other works which we find in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's corpus are collected and identified (as far as possible), would be another very useful thing to have. This too must wait for the time being, however, as particularly with the identification of citations I have not yet made sufficient progress for it to be worth attempting to present such an index here.

Some technical notes on the presentation. The corpus indexed includes *pratīka*s, quotations from other authors' writings and the colophons of the *Tarkasāgara*; in all cases where a word occurs as part of one of these this is indicated between square brackets. The *Tarkasāgara* colophons have been included because I believe that they are authorial.[9] In the case of references in the two versions of the VS commentary cross-references are added in square brackets if there are clear parallels; for those portions of the abridged version (V) which are re-edited above the corresponding page and line number in the new edition are similarly added.

Occurrences of the same name with and without a prefix such as Śrī or Bhaṭṭa or a suffix such as *ācārya* are placed under a single entry (a cross-reference being however added in the case of prefixes). The choice of the form under which the references are collected has been usually dictated by the manner in which the person in question is most usually referred to, in both classical works and modern secondary literature. Thus preference has been given to Vallabhācārya rather than Śrīvallabhācārya but to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra rather than Vādīndra.

In the hope of increasing the usefulness of the index I have adopted some further measures. When words occur as part of a compound the preceding or following word, or in some cases more than that,[10] is usually given, so that it may be possible to identify particularly interesting references with greater ease.[11] Finally, a fair

8 And of course the value of a word-index is to a great degree dependent on the quality of the editions available to prepare it from, which in the case of the works of our author is not particularly high.

9 See on this point the Introduction above, p. 12. The exception to this is the last colophon, that of the second *āhnika* of the second *adhyāya* (TS 253.10–12), for there an editorial footnote tells us that the manuscript breaks off shortly before the end of the *āhnika*, so it may be concluded that this colophon has been supplied by the editor.

10 It seemed impractical and counter-productive to give the complete compound in many cases, especially as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's compounds can be extremely long indeed.

11 To save a little space, *prabhṛti* as the posterior member of a compound has been replaced by the

number of cross-references to closely related entries are given. Both these measures have however not been applied as rigidly as some might perhaps wish.

synonymous (and more frequent) *ādi*; it was felt that nothing important was lost hereby.

aṅga TS 2.14 (*sa*° °*veda*) [≈ V 1.16], 15.30 (*sa*° °*veda*) [quote]; V 1.16 (*sa*° °*veda*) [≈ TS 2.14].

anya DKṬ 633.19 (pl.), 676.16 (pl.); GKṬ 71.12 (pl.), TS 6.22 (pl.), 6.32 (pl.), 77.3 (pl.), 108.5 (pl.) 108.20 (pl.), 120.25 (pl.), 152.6, 152.10, 188.17 (pl.), 249.12 (pl.) [≈ V 31.4]; V 31.4 (pl.) [≈ TS 249.12].

apara DKṬ 630.7.

aṣṭamādhyāya V 75.13.

asmat MVV 74.11 (pl.), 87.7 (pl.), 107.4 (pl.), 111.10 (pl.), 113.20 (pl.); DKṬ 622.26 (°*vyākhyāna*), 623.16 (pl.), 635.16 (°*mata*), 702.1 (sg.); GKṬ 46.20 (pl.), 46.25 (pl.), 64.17 (pl.), 76.12 (pl.), 87.4–5 (°*mata*); TS 1.6 (sg.), 5.3 (°*mata*), 6.5 (pl.), 9.27 (pl.), 20.5 (°*mata*), 20.27 (°*mata*), 20.31 (pl.), 44.34 (pl.), 45.2 (pl.), 53.9 (pl.), 61.6–7 (pl.), 72.31 (pl.), 96.28 (°*mata*), 128.29 (pl.), 129.31 (pl.) 135.14 (pl.), 137.4 (pl.), 138.5 (°*mata*), 138.29 (°*mata*), 142.20 (°*mata*), 142.26 (°*mata*), 143.9 (pl.), 146.12 (pl.), 146.21, 151.2 (pl.), 151.5 (pl.), 153.7 (pl.), 157.7 (°*mata*), 170.19 (°*mata*), 179.21 (°*mata*), 230.23 (°*uktapramāṇa*), 230.24 (pl.); V 5.1 (pl.).

āgama DKṬ 620.22 (°*mūlatva*) [*pratīka*], 620.25 (°*mūlatva*), 626.11; GKṬ 2.22, 3.1 (°*mātra*), 4.3 (°*mātra*) [*pratīka*], 21.13, 21.17 (*anāditva*° °*bādha*); TS 15.25, 48.7, 219.16 [≈ V 21.13], 219.20; V 1.9 (°*mūlatva*), 21.13 [≈ TS 219.16], 40.22.

ācārya DKṬ 618.7 (=Udayana), 627.1 (pl.) [*pratīka*],[12] 627.26 (°*abhipreta*), 630.29, 633.26, 637.12, 645.20 (pl.) [*pratīka*], 647.4 (pl.), 677.12; GKṬ 31.3 (=Udayana?); TS 9.26, 81.29 (pl.), 188.19 (pl.), 207.20 (pl.) [≈ V 19.5],[13] 226.6 (pl.), 249.19 (=Kaṇāda) [≈ V 31.10]; V 19.5 (pl.) [≈ TS 207.20], 31.10 (=Kaṇāda) [≈ TS 249.19]; see also *nyāyācārya*, *pūrvācārya* and *prācīnācārya*.

āmnāya DKṬ 629.3 [quote]; TS 12.33 [quote], 13.4, 13.5, 13.14, 13.21 [quote], 15.26 (°*prāmāṇya*) [quote], 15.28 [2x], 31.27 [quote], 49.24 [quote], 56.27 [quote], 57.13.

Ātreya TS 15.11 (°*mata*), 41.30 (pl.),[14] 66.24 (pl.) [≈ V 3.17], 87.23, 92.22–23 (pl.), 92.31 (pl.), 107.25 (pl.), 121.22, 123.17 (°*vyākhyāna*), 125.15 (pl.), 128.22,[15] 140.11 (pl.), 149.29 (pl.), 175.24 (pl.) [≈ V 15.8], 186.22, 187.4 (pl.), 205.25 (pl.), 215.29, 217.16 (°*ādi*), 217.17 (°*ādi*), 239.29 (°*ādi*), 242.23 (°*ādi*): V 3.17 (pl.) [≈ TS 66.24], 15.8 (pl.) [≈ TS 175.24], 65.16 (°*ādi*) [=p. 66.6 above].

itihāsa TS 13.2 (°*ādi*) [≈ V 2.17]; V 2.17 (°*ādi*) [≈ T 13.2].

Udayana MVV 83.8 (°*ādi*); DKṬ 618.5; TS 9.33, 10.2, 45.1(°*ādi*), 45.2 (°*ādi*), 60.23 (°*ādi*) [≈ V 2.26], 71.8, 98.10 (°*ādi*), 98.33 (°*ādi*), 108.30

12 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra remarks *ācāryā iti sopahāsam*.
13 The word has been restored here by Thakur.
14 Emend *ātreyācāryas tu* to *ātreyācāryās tu* to agree with the plural verb (*manyante*): quoted correctly in Thakur 1969, 490 n. 5.
15 The name has been partly restored by Thakur at this place.

16 The °*ādi* in Thakur's edition is absent in the manuscript and has not been accepted in the text I give: cf. footnote 5 on p. 79 above.

tṛtīyādhyāya V 75.8.

trisūtrī TS 13.14, 14.10, 56.21 (°*vyākhyā*) [colophon].

dvitīyādhyāya TS 119.13 (°*ādi*), 191.15; V 65.7 [=p. 64.7 above], 65.11 [=p. 64.14 above].

dvitīyāhnika TS 89.15, 158.28 [colophon], 159.25.

Dharmakīrti TS 226.9.

dharmaśāstra TS 15.30 [quote].

navamādhyāya DKṬ 623.10; TS 60.1 (°*vyatirikta*), 70.29.

navīna DKṬ 661.9 (pl.), 684.21 (pl.), 689.4 (pl.); GKṬ 31.4 (pl.).

navīnatārkika GKṬ 62.22 (°*mata*); TS 112.14 (pl.), 113.9.

naiyāyika TS 237.1 (°*ādi*).

naiyāyikaikadeśin TS 38.6.

Nyāya DKṬ 618.22 (°*śāstra*); TS 15.30 [quote], 38.6 (°*mata*).

Nyāyakusumāñjali See *Kusumāñjali*.

Nyāyabhūṣaṇa TS 129.14 (°*ādi* [≈ V 11.10 (*nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra*)]; see also *nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra*, *bhūṣaṇa* and *bhūṣaṇakāra*.

nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra GKṬ 4.14; V 11.10 (°*ādi*) [≈ TS 129.14 (Nyāyabhūṣaṇa)]; see also *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, Bhūṣaṇa and *bhūṣaṇakāra*.

nyāyavit DKṬ 618.6 (pl.), 624.21 (pl.).

Nyāyavaiśeṣika TS 27.13 (pl.).

nyāyācārya V 48.4 (pl.).

para DKṬ 626.29 (°*mata*), 627.1 (°*mata*), 627.2 (°*mata*), 630.28, 630.29 (pl.), 632.11, 639.18 (pl.), 651.6 (°*mata*), 653.11 (°*mata*), 679.12, 693.8, 696.14 (pl.), 701.16, 701.18, 701.20, 704.13 (pl.); GKṬ 41.3 (pl.), 56.6 (°*mata*), 71.24 (°*mata*), 87.19 (°*mata*), 89.6 (°*abhimata*), 90.2 (°*abhyupagata*) [*pratīka*], 90.2 (°*abhyupagama*), 90.15 (°*abhyupagama*), 90.18 (°*abhyupagata*), 90.20 (°*abhyupagata*), 90.23 (°*abhyupagata*), 90.24 (°*mata*), 96.10 (pl.) [*pratīka*], 96.12 (pl.); TS 222.16 [≈ V 22.6], 249.19 (°*pakṣasādhana*) [≈ V 31.10]; V 22.6 (°*mata*) [≈ TS 222.16], 31.10 (°*pakṣasādhana*) [≈ TS 249.19].

Pāṇini GKṬ 7.22 (°*ādi*), 7.25, 8.1 (°*ādi*); TS 8.16 (°*smaraṇa*), 18.11 (°*smṛti*), 18.16 (°*smṛti*), 18.18, 62.12 (°*smaraṇa*), 141.1 (°*ādi*); see also *vaiyākaraṇa*.

purāṇa GKṬ 21.13 (°*ādi*); TS 13.2 (°*ādi*) [≈ V 2.17], 15.30 [quote], 41.19 (°*ādi*), 41.22 (°*ādi*), 134.32 [quote]; V 2.17 [≈ TS 13.2].[17]

pūrvavaiśeṣikācārya TS 170.18.

pūrvācārya MVV 87.7 (pl.), 109.11 (pl.), 109.15 (pl.), 109.16 (pl.); GKṬ 9.11; TS 188.15.

prathamādhyāya TS 119.16 [colophon], 190.16 [colophon], 191.3, 191.7; V 64.4 [=p. 64.4 above].

prathamāhnika TS 119.17 [colophon], 159.25; V 80.3.

17 For *śrutismṛtītihāsādeḥ* as in Thakur's edition read *śrutismṛtītihāsapurāṇādeḥ* with the manuscript and in agreement with TS 13.2; cf. Isaacson 1995. 772.

18 Read *prāñcaḥ* for *prāñca*.

19 Note that the *bauddhaḥ sambandhaḥ* of DKṬ 686.3 (a *pratīka* from the *Kiraṇāvalī*), though included under the item Bauddha in Thakur's list, has nothing to do with Buddhists but simply means 'a cognitive/mental connection,' as is clear from the context.

20 Note that other places, where *bhagavān* is added before a name as an honorific and where it refers to God have not been indexed.

21 In this case the name has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

bhāṭṭa DKṬ 673.20 (pl.); TS 168.28, 168.30 (°*ādi*), 168.32 (pl.), 169.6 (pl.), 169.26, 170.28 (°*ādi*), 171.2 (°*ādi*), 171.4 (°*ādi*), 171.5, 171.7, 171.8, 171.12, 171.13 (°*mata*), 228.11 (pl.) [≈ V 24.18 (*bhaṭṭa*!)], 248.24, 249.31, 251.19 (pl.). See also Bhaṭṭa.

bhāṣya DKṬ 617.16 (°*nibandhana*), 617.16 (°*vyākhyāna*), 617.21 (°*artha*), 617.22 (°*artha*), 619.22, 622.22, 623.25 (°*virodha*), 641.15, 648.13, 649.10 (°*tātparya*), 649.11, 655.23 (°*ārūḍhatā*), 681.23, 686.7, 688.27, 689.7, 690.7, 691.27, 692.6; GKṬ 12.16 [2x], 18.15, 21.18, 22.9, 25.22, 25.23, 28.8 [2x],[22] 33.21, 34.23 (°*tātparyam*), 44.8, 47.20, 48.1 (*ukta*°), 63.22, 63.24 (*pūrva*°), 64.6, 71.2, 71.11, 79.17 (*uttara*°), 81.11, 82.21 (°*vyākhyāna*), 82.23, 83.3, 87.21, 94.11, 94.18, 94.20, 96.24, 97.4, 103.10, 103.11;

bhāṣyakāra DKṬ 623.17, 629.5, 670.1, 690.14; GKṬ 58.19, 87.19; TS 85.17 (°*ādi*), 215.12, 215.17 (pl.), 218.16 (pl.) [≈ V 21.3]; V 20.2 (°*ādi*), 21.3 (pl.) [≈ TS 218.16]; see also Praśasta, Praśastapāda, *praśastapādabhāṣyakāra* and *bhāṣyakṛt*.

bhāṣyakṛt TS 71.11; see also Praśasta, Praśastapāda, *praśastapādabhāṣyakāra* and *bhāṣyakāra*.

Bhāsarvajña See Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, *nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra*, *bhūṣaṇa* and *bhūṣaṇakāra*.

bhūṣaṇa GKṬ 4.4 [*pratīka*], 7.13; TS 115.22, 145.1 (°*ādi*), 145.7 (°*ādi*); see also Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, *nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra* and *bhūṣaṇakāra*.

bhūṣaṇakāra DKṬ 647.13; TS 207.14, 244.6 (°*ādi*); see also Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, *nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra* and Bhūṣaṇa.

Maṇḍana TS 26.26 (°*ādi*).

Manu DKṬ 656.27 (°*ādi*), 657.1 (°*ādi*), 657.15 (°*ādi*); TS 220.9 (°*ādi*) [≈ V 21.20], 220.14 (°*ādi*) [≈ V 22.2], 220.17 (°*ādi*); V 21.20 (°*ādi*) [≈ TS 220.9], 22.2 (°*ādi*) [≈ TS 220.14], 22.4 (°*ādi*), 22.5 (°*ādi*).

mahāvidyāprayoktṛ MVV 149.7 (pl.); see also *mahāvidyāvādin* and *sādhanavādin*.

mahāvidyāvādin MVV 74.6–7, 113.21, 135.27; see also *mahāvidyāprayoktṛ* and *sādhanavādin*.

Mahāvidyāviḍambana DKṬ 149.22, TS 101.16.

mādhyamika GKṬ 97.5, 97.16, 97.21.

māyāvādin GKṬ 97.5, 98.2; see also Māyāvedānta, *māyāvedāntin*, Vedānta and *vedāntin*.

Māyāvedānta TS 67.14 (°*siddhānta*); see also *māyāvādin*, *māyāvedāntin*, Vedānta and *vedāntin*.

māyāvedāntin V 70.17 [= p. 71.20 above]; see also *māyāvādin*, Vedānta and *vedāntin*.

mīmāṃsaka TS 27.12 (pl.), 38.5 (°*mata*), 48.29 (pl.), 48.30 (pl.), 48.31 (pl.), 48.32, 167.18 (pl.), 171.32, 172.2 (pl.), 172.4, 228.3 [≈ V 24.17],

22 *tad anupapannam, vyākhyānaparagranthasandarbhasya etadbhāṣyānekabhāṣyavyākhyānottarakālabhāviprakriyāvyutpādanamadhye 'tyantam asaṅgatatvāt* GKṬ 28.7–9.

23 Here the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.
24 Here the word has been restored by Thakur.
25 In the first case the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

26 The name has been partly restored by Thakur.

27 Emending the printed Śālikānāthena to Śālikanāthena.

28 In the last place the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.
29 Note that in all the occurances in GKṬ it is a sūtra of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that is meant.

30 *anekasūtravyavahitayor dvitīyāhnikasūtrayoḥ*

31 Singular in Thakur's edition, but see footnote 7 on p. 101 above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources, listed in section 1, are arranged by title according to the customary order of the Sanskrit alphabet. Secondary sources, in part 2, are ordered according to the last name of the author and using the order of the Roman alphabet.

Abbreviations of journal- and series-titles

AS	Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques.
GOS	Gaekwad's Oriental Series.
IIJ	Indo-Iranian Journal.
JIBSt	Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (*Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*).
JOI	Journal of the Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda.
VIJ	Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal.
WZKS(O)	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- (und Ost-) Asiens.

SECTION I: PRIMARY SOURCES[1]

Aṣṭaprakaraṇa

AP Aṣṭaprakaraṇam. Ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī. Varanasi 1988. Yogatantra-grantha-mālā 12.

1 In the case of Indian editions with titlepages both in Sanskrit and in English, the information from the English titlepage alone is reproduced.

Aṣṭādhyāyī

Pâṇini's Grammatik. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erlaütert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von Otto Böhtlingk. Hildesheim/New York 1977. [Reprint; first published Leipzig 1887.]

Kāvyaprakāśa

KP The Poetic Light. Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa. Vol. I [Ullāsas I–VI]. Text with Translation and Sampradāyaprakāśinī of Śrīvidyācakravartin. [Ed. and trsl.] R. C. Dwivedi. Delhi 1977. [Second revised edition]

Kiraṇāvalī

KĀ Praśastapādabhāṣyam with the commentary Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya. Ed. Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda 1971. GOS 154.

Guṇakiraṇāvalīṭīkā

GKṬ The Rasasāra of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. Ed. Gopinātha Kavirājā. Benares 1922. The Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts No. 5.

Candrānanda's commentary on the VS

C Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda, with the commentary of Candrānanda. Crit. ed. Muni Sri Jambuvijayaji. Baroda 1961. GOS 136. [A reprint of this edition appeared in 1982, but if at all possible, references should be made to the first edition. The reprint appears at first sight to be photo-mechanical but in fact contains misprints which were not in the first edition. The *śuddhipatrakam* of the first edition has also not been reproduced, although many of its corrections have not been incorporated.]

Kāśikā

Kāśikavṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (Along with Commentaries Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra and Vivaraṇapañcikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi). Ed. Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra. Varanasi 1985. [6 volumes.] Ratnabharati Series 5–10.

Tarkasāgara

TS Bhaṭṭavādīndraracita-vaiśeṣikavārtika-kṛṣṇabhūpālaracita-trisūtrīprakāśājñātakartṛkavṛttibhir vilasitam maharṣikaṇāda-praṇītam Vaiśeṣika-darśanam. Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1985.

Dravyakiraṇāvalīṭīkā

DKṬ Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya. Edited by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha. Calcutta 1956. Bibliotheca Indica 200, Fasciculus 4. [Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *dravya* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* is edited as an Appendix, covering p. 618–706.]

Nyāyakandalī

NK[1] The Praśastapāda Bhāshya with commentary Nyāyakandali of Sridhara. Ed. Vindhyesvari Prasad Dvivedin. Reprinted, Delhi 1984. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 13. [First published Benares 1895].

NK[2] Nyāyakandalī, being a commentary on Praśastabādabhāṣya, with three sub-commentaries. Edited by Late Dr. J. S. Jetly and Vasant G. Parikh. Vadodara 1991. GOS 174.

Nyāyakumudacandra

NKC Nyāya-Kumuda-Candra of Śrīmat Prabhācandrācārya: A Commentary on Bhaṭṭākalaṅkadeva's Laghīyastraya. Ed. Mahendra Kumar Nyāyācārya. 2 volumes. Delhi 1991. [Reprint, with a new foreword by V.N. Jha. First edition Bombay 1941.]

Nyāyabhāṣya

NBh[1] Nyāyadarśanam, with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotkara's [sic] Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyaṭīkā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti. Chapter I, Section I critically edited with notes [by] Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha and Chapters I-ii—V by Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha, with an introduction by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha. Delhi 1985. [Second edition; first published Calcutta 1936–1944.]

NBh[2] Nyāyadarśana of Gautama, with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana, the Vārttika of Uddyotakara, the Tātparyaṭīkā of Vācaspati and the Pariśuddhi of Udayana (Volume I chapter I). Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1967. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text no. 20.

Nyāyabhūṣaṇa

NBhū Śrīmadācāryabhāsarvajñapraṇītasya Nyāyasārasya svopajñaṃ vyākhyānaṃ Nyāyabhūṣaṇam. Ed. Svāmī Yogīndrānanda. Vārāṇasī 1968. Ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā 1.

Nyāyamañjarī

NM[1] The Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. Ed. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla. 2 volumes. Benares 1934–1936. Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 106.

NM[2] Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhaṭṭa, with Ṭippaṇi—Nyāyasaurabha by the editor. Crit. ed. K. S. Varadacharya. Vol. I. Mysore 1969. Oriental Research Institute Series No. 116.

Nyāyaratnamālā

Nyāyaratnamālā of Pārthasārathimiśra, with the commentary of Rāmānujācārya entitled, the Nayakaratna. Critically edited with an introduction and Indices by K. S. Rāmaswami Śāstri Śiromaṇi. Baroda 1937. GOS 75.

Nyāyalīlāvatī

The Nyāya Līlāvatī Ry [sic] Vallabhāchārya. With the Commentaries of Vardhamānopadhyāya, Śaṅkara Miśra and Bhagīratha Ṭhakkura. Edited with notes, Introduction, & Index etx., By (1) Pandit Harihara Śastri Lecturer, Benares Hindu University, 1–5 Fas. (2) Nyāyopādhyāya Pandit Dhundhirāja Śâstri Principal, N.V. Vidyalaya Benares. 6–9 Fas. Benares [1927–]1934. The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Nos. 355, 376, 379, 387, 400, 407, 409, 412 & 422.

Nyāyavārttika, *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* and *Tātparyapariśuddhi*

NV For edition used see under NBh².

Nyāyasāravicāra

Nyāyasāra-Vicāra of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava. Ed. Umā Ramaṇa Jha. Jammu 1976.

Nyāyasūtra

NS For editions used see under *Nyāyabhāṣya* above. See also under Ruben in Section II below.

Padārthadharmasaṃgraha

PDhS References are to the edition NK¹ described above unless specified otherwise. For other editions see under KĀ, NK², Vyo¹, Vyo² and, in Section II, Bronkhorst and Ramseier.

Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa

A Trident of Wisdom. Translation of [Abhinavagupta's] Parātriśikā-vivaraṇa by Jaideva Singh. Foreword by Paul Muller-Ortega. Albany, N.Y. 1989. SUNY Series in Tantric Studies. [Contains Sanskrit text with separate pagination.]

Prakaraṇapañcikā

PP Prakaraṇa Pañcikā of Śālikanātha Miśra with the Nyāya-Siddhi of Jaipuri Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by A. Subrahmanya Sastri. Benares 1961. Banaras Hindu University Darśana Series No. 4.

Pramāṇamañjarī

Tārkikacūḍāmaṇi-Sarvadevaviracitā Pramāṇamañjarī. Saṃpādakartā Paṃ. Paṭṭābhirāma Śāstrī. Jayapura (Rājasthāna) 1953. Rājasthāna Purātana Granthamālā 4.

Mahāvidyāviḍambana

MVV Mahávidyá-vidambana of Bhatta Vádîndra, with the commentaries of Ánandapurṇa and Bhuvanasundara Sûri, and the Daśa-Sloki of Kulárka Pandita with Vivarana and Vivarana Tippana. Edited with Introduction and Appendices by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang. Baroda 1920. GOS 12.

Mānameyodaya

Mānameyodaya of Nārāyaṇa (An Elementary Treatise on the Mīmāṃsā). Edited with an English Translation by C. Kunhan Raja and S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Madras 1975. [Second edition; first edition 1933]. The Adyar Library Series. Vol. 105.

Mānamanohara

Śrīmadācāryavādivāgīśvarapraṇītaḥ Mānamanoharaḥ. Ed. Svāmī Yogīndrānandaḥ. Varanasi 1973. Ṣaḍdarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā 2.

Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa

The Mīmāṅsā Nyāya Prakāśa, or Āpadevī: A treatise on the Mīmāṅsā system by Āpadeva. Translated into English, with an Introduction, transliterated Sanskrit text and glossarial Index, by Franklin Edgerton. New Haven 1929.

Yuktidīpikā

Yuktidīpikā: An ancient Commentary on the Sāṃkhya-Kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Ed. Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi etc. 1967.

Abridged version of the *Tarkasāgara*

V Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda, with an anonymous commentary. Edited by Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1957. [Reprinted as appendix one of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*. The reprint adds new printing mistakes and does not incorporate the corrigenda appended to the original edition.]

Vaiśeṣikasūtra

VS For editions used see under C, TS, V and VSU.

Vaiśeṣikasūtropaskāra

VSU The Vaiśeshika Darśana, with the commentaries of Śankara Miśra and Jayanārāyaṇa Panchānana. Ed. Pandita Jayanārāyana Tarka Panchānana. Calcutta 1861. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series 24.

Vyomavatī

Vyo[1] Praśastapādabhāṣyam of Praśasta Devāchārya, with commentaries (up to Dravya), Sūkti – by Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, Setu – by Padmanābha Miśra, and Vyomavatī by Vyomaśivāchārya (to the end). Ed. Gopinath Kaviraj and Dhundhiraj Shastri. Reprinted, Benares 1983. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 61. [First published Benares 1930.

Vyo[2] Vyomavatī of Vyomaśivācārya. Ed. Gaurinath Sastri. 2 volumes. Varanasi 1983–1984. M.M. Śivakumāraśāstri-Granthamālā vol. 6.

MS Manuscript C-1575, Oriental Research Institute, University of Mysore.

Śābarabhāṣya

Śrīmajjaiminipraṇīta mīmāṃsādarśana. Ed. Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyaṃkar and Gaṇeśaśāstrī Jośī. [7 volumes.] Pune 1972–1981. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 97.

Ślokavārttika

Ślokavārttika of Śrī Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with the commentary Nyāyaratnākara of Śrī Pārthasārathi Miśra. Ed. Svāmī Dvārikadāsa Śāstrī. Varanasi 1978. Prāchyabhārati Series 10.

Saptapadārthī

Saptapadārthī of Śivādityamiśra, with Jinavardhanasūri's Vyākhyā. Ed. J. S. Jetly. Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 1

Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha

SDS Śrīmādhavācāryapraṇītaḥ Sarvadarśanasaṃgrahaḥ, Madhusūdanasarasvatīkṛtaḥ Prasthānabhedaś ca. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 51.

'Sena Court' commentary on the VS.

S An edition of *adhyāya* 9 is included as the second appendix in Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*. The tenth *adhyāya* survives in a palm-leaf manuscript in Newari script in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta (No. G-4737). The *sūtrapāṭha* of this commentary for both the ninth and the tenth *adhyāya* is given in Thakur 1965.

SECTION II: SECONDARY LITERATURE

Adriaensen, R., Bakker, H. T. and Isaacson, H.

1994 Towards a Critical Edition of the *Skandapurāṇa*. in: IIJ 37 (1994), 325–331.

Aklujkar, Ashok

1970 Candrānanda's date. in: JOI 19 (1969/1970), 340–341.

Altekar, A. S.

1982 The Yādavas of Seuṇadeśa. Part VII in: G. Yazdani (ed.): The Early History of the Deccan. Parts VII–XI. New Delhi. [First published in 1960.] p. 513–574.

Bhandarkar, Shridhar R.

1888 A Catalogue of the Collections of Manuscripts Deposited in the Deccan College, with an Index. Bombay.

Bhattacharya, Dineshchandra
1958 History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā. Darbhanga. Mithilā Institute Series 3 Studies No. 2.

Bhaskaran, T.
1984 Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. Vol. III (Ya to Sa). Edited and published by T. Bhaskaran. Trivandrum.

Birwé, Robert
1961 Der Gaṇapāṭha zu den Adhyāyas IV und V der Grammatik Pāṇinis. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion. Wiesbaden.

Bronkhorst, Johannes
1993a The Vaiśeṣika Vākya and Bhāṣya. in: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 52–53 (1991–1992) [appeared in 1993], 145–169.
1993b Studies on Bhartṛhari, 5: Bhartṛhari and Vaiśeṣika. in: Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques 47.1 (1993), 76–94.

Bronkhorst, Johannes and Ramseier, Yves
1994 Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya: a complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya. Delhi.

Bühler, G.
1896 Indische Palaeographie, von circa 350 A. Chr.—circa 1300 P. Chr. Strassbourg. Grundriss der indi-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, I. Band, 11. Heft.

Burnell, Arthur Coke
1878 Elements of south-Indian palaeography, from the fourth to the seventeenth century A.D. Second enlarged and improved edition. London.

Chemparathy, George
1968 The Īśvara doctrine of Praśastapāda. in: VIJ 6 (1968), 65–87.
1969a Two little-known fragments from early Vaiśeṣika literature on the omniscience of Īśvara. in: The Adyar Library Bulletin 33 (1969), 117–134.
1969 The various names for the famous Vaiśeṣika work of Praśastapāda. in: Ṛtam vol. 1 no. 1 (1969), 23–27.
1970a Praśastapāda and his other names. in: Indo-Iranian Journal vol. 12 (1969/1970), 241–254.
1970b The Īśvara doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika commentator Candrānanda. in: Ṛtam vol. 1 no. 2 (1970), 47–52.
1972 An Indian Rational Theology. Introduction to Udayana's Nyāyakusumāñjali. Vienna. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Vol. I.

Clooney, Francis X.
1990 Thinking Ritually: Rediscovering the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā of Jaimini. Vienna. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library vol. 17.

Dearing, Vinton A.
1979 Response to M. P. Weitzman [cf. Weitzman 1977]. in: Vetus Testamentum 29 (1977), 355–359.
1983 A Manual of Textual Analysis. Westport, Connecticut. [First published Berkeley 1959].

Edgerton, Franklin
1929 See *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* in Section I.

EDHSP
1976– An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles. General editor A. M. Ghatage (from vol. 3 part 3 S. D. Joshi). Poona.

Faddegon, B.
1918 The Vaiçeṣika-system, described with the help of the oldest texts. Amsterdam. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks. Deel XVIII no. 2.

Flight, Colin
1992 Stemmatic theory and the analysis of complicated traditions. in: Manuscripta 36 (1992), 37–52.

Franco, Eli
1994 Perception, Knowledge and Disbelief: A Study of Jayarāśi's Scepticism. Delhi. [Second edition; first edition Stuttgart 1987.]

Frauwallner, Erich
1955 Candramati und sein Daśapadārthaśāstram. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Vaiśeṣika. in: Studia Indologica, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel (Bonner Orientalische Studien 3) Bonn 1955, 65–85
1956 Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie. Band 2. Salzburg.
1970 Die Lehre von der zusätzlichen Bestimmung (*upādhiḥ*) in Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇiḥ. Wien.
1984 Der ursprüngliche Anfang der Vaiśeṣika-Sūtren. in: E. Frauwallner: Nachgelassene Werke I. Aufträge, Beiträge, Skizzen. Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 19). Wien, 35–41.

1992 Nachgelassene Werke II. Philosophische Texte des Hinduismus. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer und Chlodwig H. Werba. Wien. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 588. Band = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Nr. 26.

Gerow, E.
1990 The Jewel-Necklace of Argument (The *Vādaratnāvalī* of Viṣṇudāsācārya). New Haven. American Oriental Society Translation Series vol. 2.

Goekoop, Cornelis
1967 The Logic of Invariable Concomitance in the Tattvacintāmaṇi. Gaṅgeśa's Anumitinirūpaṇa and Vyāptivāda with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Dordrecht. [Dissertation, University of Amsterdam]

Gonda, Jan
1975 Vedic Literature (Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas). Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature vol. I, fasc. 1.

Gough, Archibald Edward
1975 The Vaiśeshika Aphorisms of Kaṇâda, with comments from the Upaskâra of Śankara Misra and the Vivritti of Jaya-Nârâyaṇa Tarkapañchânana. Delhi. [First published in 1873.]

Greetham, D. C.
1992 Textual Scholarship: An Introduction. New York/London.

Greg, W. W.
1927 The Calculus of Variants. An Essay on Textual Criticism. Oxford.

Grünendahl, Reinhold
1993 Zur Klassifizierung von Mahābhārata-Handschriften. in: Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Proffessor Dr. Heinz Bechert. Herausgegeben von Reinhold Grünendahl. Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Bonn 1993. p. 101–130.

Halbfass, Wilhelm
1991 Tradition and Reflection. Explorations in Indian Thought. Albany.
1992 On Being and What There Is. Classical Vaiśeṣika and the History of Indian Ontology. Albany.

Hall, Fitzedward
1859 A contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the Indian philosophical systems. Calcutta.

Handiqui, Krishna Kanta

1965 Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīharṣa. For the first time translated into English with critical Notes and Extracts from unpublished Commentaries, Appendices and a Vocabulary. Poona. [Third Edition.]

Hara, Minoru

1992 Pāśupata Studies (1). in: *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in honor of André Padoux*. Edited by Teun Goudriaan. Albany, N.Y, 1992. SUNY Series in Tantric Studies. p. 209–226.

Hattori, Masaaki

1968a Two types of non-qualificative perception. in: Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens: Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner. WZKSO XII/XIII (1968/1969), 161–169.

1972 Praśastapāda and Dignāga. A note on the development of the Vaiśeṣika theory of anumāna. in: WZKS XVI (1972), 169–180.

Honda, Megumu

1990 A reading in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. in: Dōhō daigaku kiyō 4 (1990), 172–79.

1993 *pratyagātman* in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. in: WZKS 32 (1992), Supplement: Proceedings of the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vienna 1990. Wien 1993. p. 293–297.

Houben, Jan E. M.

1992 The Saṃbandha-Samuddeśa (Chapter on Relation) and Bhartṛhari's Philosophy of Language. Utrecht. [Dissertation; a revised version is to be published in 1995.]

1995 Liberation and natural philosophy in early Vaiśeṣika: some methodological problems. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 711–748.

Isaacson, Harunaga

1990 A study of early Vaiśeṣika: the teachings on perception. Groningen 1990. [Unpublished M.A. thesis.]

1994 Yogic perception (*yogipratyakṣa*) in early Vaiśeṣika. in: Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 18 (1993) [appeared in 1994], 139–160.

1995 Notes on the manuscript transmission of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra and its earliest commentaries. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 749–779.

Jhā, Gaṅganātha (trsl.)

1983 Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: Tantravārttika. A Commentary on Śabara's Bhāṣya on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini. 2 volumes. Delhi 1983. [First published Calcutta 1903–1924.]

Jhalakīkar, Bhīmācārya
1978 Nyāyakośa or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy. Revised and re-edited by Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar. Poona. [Forth edition.] Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. XLIX.

Kane, Pandurang Vaman
1973 History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediæval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. III. Poona 1973. (Second Edition).
1974a History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediæval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. II, Part II. Poona 1974. (Second Edition).
1974b History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediæval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. V, Part I. Poona 1974. (Second Edition).

Kaviraj, Gopinath [Gopīnātha Kavirāja]
1929 Some variants in the readings of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras. in: Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Studies 7 (1929), 71–76.
1961 Gleanings from the history and bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature. Calcutta. Indian Studies Past and Present. [First published in the Princess of Wales Saraswatī Bhavana Series, vols. III–V, 1924.]

Kiehnle, Catharina
1979 Vedisch ukṣ und ukṣ/vakṣ. Wortgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchungen. Wiesbaden 1979. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 21.

Marui, Hiroshi
1985 A Study on the Textual Problems of the Padārthadharmasaṃgraha. in: Tōhō 1 (1985), 106–120.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna
1968 The Navya-nyāya Doctrine of Negation. The Semantics and Ontology of Negative Statements in Navya-nyāya Philosophy. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 46.
1977 Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature vol. VI, fasc. 2.

Mishra, Umesh
1987 Conception of Matter according to the NyāyaVaiśeṣika. Reprinted, New Delhi. [First published Allahabad, 1936.]

Motegi, Shūjun
1995 Some Vaiśeṣika thoughts referred to in the Yuktidīpikā. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 807–817.

Nenninger, Claudius
1992 Aus gutem Grund. Praśastapāda's anumāna-Lehre und die drei Bedingungen des logischen Grundes. Reinbek. Philosophia Indica: Einsichten, Ansichten Bd. 1.

Nozawa, Masanobu
1974 The sūtrapāṭha of the Vaiçeṣikasūtra-vyākhyā. in: JIBSt vol. 23 no. 1 (1974), 474–471.
1976 The Vaiśeṣikasūtra referred to in the Padārthadharmasaṃgraha. in: JIBSt vol. 24 no. 2 (1976), 1000–1006.
1985 A Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. in: Numazu Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō Kenkyū Hōkoku 20 (1985), 75–93.
1993a The Vaiśeṣikasūtra with Candrānanda's Commentary (1). in: Numazu Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō Kenkyū Hōkoku 27 (1992) [appeared in 1993], 97–116.
1993b Theory of Perception in the 8th Adhyāya of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. IBK 41.2 (1993), 1156(7)–1150(13).

Oetke, Claus
1988 "Ich" und das Ich. Analytische Untersuchungen zur buddhistisch-brahmanischen Ātmankontroverse. Stuttgart. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 33.

Pandeya, A.N.
1953 Ātreya and his Bhāṣya on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtras. in: Summaries of Papers (submitted to the 17th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference), ed. by the local secretary. Ahmedabad 1953, 258–260. [To the best of my knowledge the full paper was never published.]

Potter, Karl H. (ed.)
1977 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. II: Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa. Princeton 1977.
1983 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. I: Bibliography. Delhi 1983.

Potter, Karl H. and Bhattacharyya, Sibajiban
1993 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. VI: Indian Philosophical Analysis: Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika from Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi. Delhi.

Preisendanz, Karin
1995 Vaiśeṣikasūtra IV.1.9 and its two traditions of interpretation. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 867–890.

Raghavan, V.
1963 Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa. Madras.

Ramanujam, P.S.
1979 A study of Vaiśeṣika philosophy with special reference to Vyomaśivācārya. Mysore.

Renou, Louis and Filliozat, Jean
1953 L'Inde Classique. Manuel des Études Indiennes. Tome II. Paris//Hanoi.

Robinson, Fred C.
1994 The Editing of Old English. Oxford.

Salemans, Ben
1990 Text genealogical remarks on Lachmann, Bédier, Greg and Dearing. in: Leuvense Bijdragen 79 (1990), 427–468.

Schmithausen, Lambert
1970 Zur Lehre von der vorstellungsfreien Wahrnehmung bei Praśastapāda. in: WZKS XIV (1970), 125–129.

Shackleton Bailey, David R.
1976 Editing Ancient Texts. in: Herbert H. Paper (ed.), Language and Texts. The Nature of Linguistic Evidence. Ann Arbor 1976, p. 21–32.

Shah, Umakant P.
1975 A reference to Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda by Abhinavagupta. in: Saṃbodhi vol. 4 no. 1 (1975), 7-8.

Sharma, V. Venkatarama
1951 Vaiśeṣika-sūtras. in: JOI 1 (1951), 225–227.

Shastri, Dharmendra Nath
1976 The philosophy of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and its conflict with the Buddhist Dignāga school (Critique of Indian Realism). Reprinted. Delhi/ Varanasi. [First published Agra 1964.]

Slaje, Walter
1983 Die Wahrnehmungslehre bei Vyomaśivaḥ. Wien. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation.]
1993 Śāradā. Deskriptiv-synchrone Schriftkunde zur Bearbeitung kaschmirischer Sanskrit-Manuskripte. Auf der Grundlage von Kuśala's *Ghaṭakharpara-Gūḍhadīpikā* und unter graphischer Mitwirkung von Eva Slaje. Reinbek. Indische Schriften. Band 1.

Solomon, Esther A.
1976 Indian Dialectics: Methods of Philosophical Discussion. Volume I. Ahmedabad 1976. Sheth Bholabhai Jeshingbhai Institute of Learning and Research, Research Series, No. 70.

Speyer, J. S.
1886 Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden.

Srinivasan, Srinivasa Ayya
1967 Vācaspatimiśra's Tattvakaumudī: Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung. Hamburg. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 12.

Tachikawa, Musashi
1981 The Structure of the World in Udayana's Realism. A study of the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* and the *Kiraṇāvalī*. Dordrecht. Studies of Classical India vol. 4.

Tanaka, Norihiko
1987 A New Manuscript of the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* Preserved in Kashmir University. in: Jimbungaku-ronshū (Journal of Humanistic Studies) 21 (1987), 1–45.
1991 The Tradition of the *Padārthadharmasaṃhraha* in *śāradā* script. in: Bukkyō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō 75 (1991), 1–24.
1994 The *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* of Praśastapāda. Volume I: *Dravyaprakaraṇa*. [Part I Variant Readings of the Manuscripts (1)]. Kyoto 1994.

Tanselle, G. Thomas
1990 Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing. Charlottesville/London. [Collection of papers published between 1971 and 1983.]
1994 Editing without a Copy-Text. in: Studies in Bibliography 47 (1994), 1–22.

Thakur, Anantalal
1947 Ātreya - the Bhāṣyakāra. in: Indian Culture vol. 13 no. 3 (1947), 185–188.
1949 Uddyotakara as a Vaiśeṣika. in: Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference Fifteenth Session. Bombay 1949, 327–334.
1960 Bhaṭṭavādīndra - the Vaiśeṣika. in: JOI 10 (1960), 22–31.
1963a Vātsyāyana and the Vaiśeṣika system. in: VIJ 1 (1963), 78–86.
1963b Textual problems of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras. in: Journal of the Bihar Research Society 49 (1963), 186–188.
1965 Studies in a fragmentary Vaiśeṣikasūtravṛtti. in: JOI 14 (1965), 330–335.
1969 The problem of the *Vaiśeṣika-bhāṣya*. in: Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi January 4-10 1962 vol. III pt. I. Poona 1969, 489–493.

1975 Vācaspatimiśra's Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā and the Vaiśeṣika system. in: Sanskrit and Indological Studies. Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume. Ed. R.N. Dandekar et. al. Delhi 1975. 425–435.

Telang, Mangesh Ramakrishna
1920 See *Mahāvidyāviḍambana* in Section I.

Tripathi, Chandrabhal
1975 Catalogue of the Jaina manuscripts of Strasbourg: Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg. Leiden. Indologia Berolinensis Bd. 4.

Türstig, Hans-Georg
1982 Über Entstehungsprozesse in der Philosophie des *NyāyaVaiśeṣika*-Systems. Wiesbaden. Beiträge zur Südasienforschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg Band 78.

Ui, Hakuju
1962 The Vaiśeshika philosophy, according to the Daśapadārtha-Śāstra. Chinese text with introduction, translation and notes. Second edition, Varanasi. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies vol. XXII. [First edition London 1917. Royal Asiatic Society. Oriental Translation Fund, N.S., vol. XXIV.]

Upadhye, A.N. (ed.)
1971 Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyāvatāra (ed. by the late S.C. Vidyabhusan with English Translation Notes etc.) and with the Vivṛti of Siddharṣi as well as the text of 21 Dvātriṁśikās and the Sammaī-Suttam. Vinayavijaya's Nayakarṇikā (ed. by the late M.D. Desai with English Translation etc.). Bombay.

Verpoorten, Jean-Marie
1987 Mīmāṃsā Literature. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature Vol. VI Fasc. 5.

Weitzman, M. P.
1977 Review of V. A. Dearing *Principles and practice of textual analysis* (Berkeley 1974) [cf. Dearing 1983]. in: Vetus Testamentum 27 (1977), 225–235.

West, Martin
1973 Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, applicable to Greek and Latin texts. Stuttgart.

Wezler, Albrecht
1982a Remarks on the definition of '*yoga*' in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. in: Indological and Buddhist studies. Volume in honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his sixtieth birthday. Ed. by L.A. Hercus et. al. Canberra 1982. p. 643–686.

1982b Manu's Omniscience: On the Interpretation of *Manusmṛti* II, 7. in: Indology and Law: Studies in Honour of Professor J. Duncan M. Derrett. Ed. Günther-Dietz Sontheimer and Parameswara Kota Aithal. Wiesbaden 1982. Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung 77. p. 79–105.

1983a A note on concept *adṛṣṭa* as used in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. in: Aruṇabhāratī. Professor A.N. Jani felicitation volume (Essays in contemporary indological research). Ed. by B. Datta et. al. Baroda 1983, 35–58.

1983b Philological Observations on the so-called Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa. (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa I). in: IIJ 25 (1983), 17–40.

1984 Further references to the Vaiśeṣikasūtra in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa. (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa III.) in: Amṛtadhara. Prof. R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume. Ed. by S.D. Joshi. Delhi 1984, 457–472.

1985 Bemerkungen zu Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra 6.1.1–3 (Resümee). in: XXII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, vom 21. bis 25. März 1983 in Tübingen. Ausgewählte Vorträge. Ed. Wolgang Röllig. Stuttgart 1985. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement VI. p. 282.

Whitney, William Dwight

1885 The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. Leipzig.

Nederlandse samenvatting (Dutch summary)

Dit proefschrift bevat een aantal afzonderlijke edities en studies van belangrijke teksten van het Vaiśeṣika, een stroming die met name in het eerste millennium een belangrijke rol speelde in de Indiase filosofie. Onderzocht werd of, en in hoeverre, een nieuwe studie van manuscript materiaal verbeteringen ten opzichte van eerdere edities mogelijk zou maken.

In deel één staat de commentaar van Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra op het *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS) centraal. Een uitgebreide inleiding bespreekt ondermeer Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's datum, zijn werken en zijn belang als filosoof. Aangetoond wordt dat deze auteur op vele punten eigenzinnige theorieën had, die niet uit andere bronnen bekend zijn. Ook wordt ingegaan op de relatie tussen de twee recensies van Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentaar op het VS. De conclusie is dat de langere recensie Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's oorspronkelijk werk is, en dat de kortere een verkorte versie vormt die gemaakt is door een andere, anonieme, persoon. Vervolgens wordt een her-editie geboden van twee delen van de korte recensie. Deze is—in tegenstelling tot de *editio princeps* van A. Thakur—rechtstreeks gebaseerd op (foto's van) het enig bekende handschrift. Mede hierdoor is het mogelijk gebleken op vele punten de tekst te verbeteren. Tevens wordt voor het eerst een vertaling gegeven van de geëditeerde delen, voorzien van aantekeningen die tekstuele en inhoudelijke problemen bespreken.

Deel twee biedt een soortgelijke studie van de commentaar van Candrānanda op het VS. Een aantal niet eerder gebruikte manuscripten van deze commentaar is aan het licht gekomen; de handschriften en hun relatie worden besproken. Vervolgens wordt een nieuwe editie gegeven van de opening van de commentaar; ook hier bleek verbetering mogelijk ten opzichte van de overigens uitstekende eerste editie van Jambūvijaya. Van het geëditeerde deel is al eerder een Engelse vertaling verschenen (Nozawa 1993a); mede hierom wordt in plaats van een vertaling een commentaar gegeven, waarin afwijkingen van de eerdere editie gerechtvaardigd, en tekstuele en inhoudelijke moeilijkheden besproken worden.

In deel drie worden twee handschriften besproken die de tekst van het VS bevatten zonder een commentaar. Beiden worden diplomatisch geëditeerd. Tevens wordt een hypothetische reconstructie gegeven van de tekst van de sūtras, waarbij gepoogd wordt overleveringsfouten voor zover mogelijk te corrigeren. Aangetoond wordt dat de tekst van beide handschriften in ieder geval niet afgeleid kan zijn van een van de andere bekende recensies van de VS (met een commentaar). Voorgesteld wordt dat beiden beschouwd moeten worden als vertegenwoordigers van recensies

die niet elders gedocumenteerd zijn, en dat beiden ooit geassociëerd zijn geweest met commentaar-tradities die niet overgeleverd of nog niet ontdekt zijn. Eerste aanzetten worden geboden voor evaluatie van deze twee 'nieuwe' recensies; er wordt betoogd dat voor onderzoek naar met name de vroege geschiedenis van het Vaiśeṣika het van groot belang is ook dit materiaal in beschouwing te nemen.

Het proefschrift wordt afgesloten met vier Appendices. Appendix 1 bestaat uit een concordantie van de verschillende recensies van het VS. In Appendix 2 wordt een concordantie gegeven van de handschriften van Candrānanda's commentaar op het VS. Appendix 3 bespreekt in detail de tekstkritische problemen rond een andere belangrijke Vaiśeṣika tekst, de *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* van Praśastapāda. Appendix 4 bevat een index van verwijzingen naar personen en teksten die worden aangetroffen in de werken van Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

Curriculum vitae

Born in Kuma, Japan, August 23, 1965. Secondary education at Praedinius Gymnasium, Groningen, 1978—1984. Studied philosophy and indology at the University of Groningen from September 1985. *Doctoraal* (roughly equivalent to M.A.) degree awarded May 1990 (*cum laude*). Studied at the Seminar für Geschichte und Kultur Indiens und Tibets, Universität Hamburg, from October 1990 through February 1991. Attached to the University of Groningen as research assistent (OIO) sponsored by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) from March 1, 1991, to March 1, 1995. Michael Coulson Junior Research Fellow in Indology at Wolfson College, Oxford, from October through December 1994.